DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 050 871 88 RC 005 302

TITLE	Education in Nevada: An Assessment, 1970 Study.
INSTITUTION	Nevada State Dept. of Education, Carson City.; Nevada Univ., Reno. Coll. of Education.
SPONS AGENCY	Division of Plans and Supplementary Centers, BESE.
PUB DATE	26 Oct 70
NOTE	136p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58
DESCRIPTORS	Educational Improvement, *Educational Needs, *Educational Objectives, *Program Evaluation, *Rural Urban Differences, *State Programs, Surveys
IDENTIFIERS	*Nevada

ABSTRACT

Determining the imperative educational needs in the State of Nevada constituted the general purpose of this study funded under Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Utilizing the 1969 Wisconsin Educational Needs Assessment Study instrument, the study sought to evaluate educational needs in terms of subject fields to be taught, level of education needed in the various school districts, pre-vocational and occupational programs, teacher personnel concerns (e.g., salaries), administrative and pupil services, budget allocations, instructional approaches, educational programs, and inservi e education. After a discussion of the foregoing areas of need, composite educational needs representing the sample population (n=451)--school board members, educators, students, and citizens from urban, rural, and remote areas--are noted. It is concluded that reading, education in motivating and guiding pupils, diagnosing pupil needs, individually guided instruction, and teacher personnel are among the high-priority items in planning for education in Nevada. Two appendixes, 28 tables, and 13 figures illustrate the report. (MJB)

ED050871

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

RECEIVED
MAY 28 1971
CLEARINGHOUSE
E.R.I.C.

EDUCATION IN NEVADA

AN ASSESSMENT FOR 1970

RC005302

EL050871

M E M O R A N D U M

October 26, 1970

TO: Citizens of Nevada

FROM: Burnell Larson, Superintendent of Public Instruction

SUBJECT: Education in Nevada: An Assessment for 1970

This document has been prepared for distribution by the Nevada State Department of Education. It is the second study made by the Department of Education in a continuing effort to assess educational progress in Nevada. It is another step toward the goal of establishing an ongoing assessment and evaluation of educational progress, teacher effectiveness and student performance.

The Assessment was designed as a perceptual study to determine how a selected group of respondents feels about the relative need for emphasis that should be given to various aspects of the public school operation. Educational policies cannot be derived directly from polled opinions, but when they are corroborated by findings of related studies, such information can assist the Department of Education and other policy-making agencies in management decisions, program planning and allocation of funds.

Conclusions and implications of the Assessment call for action to which the Department of Education and school districts can respond. Immediate action can be

taken by updating appropriate parts of the "Maste
curriculum priorities, developing in-service trai
patterns and improving recruitment practices.

Data from the study, in combination with pre
provide the Department's new Planning and Evaluat
statewide information system. This information w
model for the continuous assessment of educationa
performance.

"Master Plan for Education," assigning new
ce training programs, reviewing staffing
ces.
with previous assessment information, will
Evaluation Division data needed for a
mation will also assist in the design of a
ucational needs and evaluation of student

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

It has been our pleasure to work once again on a cooperative venture with the Nevada State Department of Education Assessment Committee. Their guidelines for the project, timely discussions concerning project progress, and review of the rough draft of the report were valuable to the research staff. Many thanks to the following members of that Committee:

Mr. Robert Best, Chairman
Mr. Merlin Anderson
Mr. James Costa
Mr. John Gamble
Mr. Denis Graham
Mr. James Kiley
Mr. LaMar LeFevre
Mr. Robert Lloyd
Mr. James Menath
Mr. Tom Ogg
Dr. Kay Palmer
Mr. Harvey Thiel

The Research and Educational Planning Center appreciates the wholehearted cooperation of all project interviewees throughout the State of Nevada who provided the essential information for this project.

We also wish to acknowledge the excellent work accomplished by our staff interviewers who spent many hours traveling throughout the state to complete their interviewing tasks.

The Research office staff is commended for the excellent typing, format and technical work on the report.

J. Clark Davis, Director
Research and Educational Planning Center
College of Education, Univ of Nevada
Reno, Nevada

RESEARCH AND EDUCATIONAL PLANNING CENTER

ASSESSMENT PROJECT RESEARCH STAFF

Mr. Bill Beitz . . . . . Clark County School District

Dr. Frank Brunetti . . . . . Stanford University

Dr. Dana Davis . . . . . University of Nevada, Reno

Dr. J. Clark Davis . . . . . University of Nevada, Reno

Mrs. Margaret Goodman . . . . . University of Nevada, Reno

Dr. Kenneth Hansen . . . . . University of Washington, Pullman

Dr. George Jeffs . . . . . Clark County School District

Dr. James M. Lipham . . . . . University of Wisconsin, Madison

Mrs. Gerry P. McGinley . . . . . University of Nevada, Reno

Dr. Donald McIsaac . . . . . University of Wisconsin, Madison

Dean Tony Saville . . . . . University of Nevada, Las Vegas

Mr. S. Carl Traegde . . . . . University of Nevada, Reno

Dr. Len L. Trout . . . . . University of Nevada, Reno

Dr. Ralph W. Tyler . . . . . Science Research Associates, Chicago

Dr. Jack Vergiels . . . . . University of Nevada, Las Vegas

RESEARCH AND EDUCATIONAL PLANNING CENTER

ASSESSMENT PROJECT INTERVIEWERS

Northern Team

Mrs. Judy Allen
Mrs. Jo Butler
Mrs. Carol Gloster
Mr. Steve Gomez
Mrs. Margaret Goodman
Miss Patricia Miltenberger
Mrs. Jean Pagni Smith
Mrs. Janet Peevers
Mrs. Frances Trout
Miss Judy Valley
Mrs. Shirlee Wedow

Southern Team

Mrs. Patricia Beitz
Mrs. Marian Berman
Mrs. Romietta Hawkins
Mrs. Pat Luetkehans
Mrs. Walter Nielsen

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	OBJECTIVES AND DESIGN OF THE STUDY	1
	Purpose of the Study and Problems Investigated	1
	Procedures of the Study	2
	School Districts Included in the Study	2
	Respondent Groups	3
	The Interview Instrument	4
	Training of the Interviewers and Gathering of Data	6
	Treatment of the Data	7
	Summary	9
II.	SPECIFIC EDUCATIONAL NEEDS	10
	Category I: Subject Fields	10
	Category II: Level of Education	15
	Category III: Pre-Vocational and Occupational Programs	20
	Category IV: Teacher Personnel Concerns	25
	Category V: Administrative Services	29
	Category VI: Pupil Services	34
	Category VII: Budget Allocations	39
	Category VIII: Instructional Approaches	44

CHAPTER

Category IX: Educational Programs . . . . . .
Category X: In-Service Education . . . . . .
Summary . . . . . .
III. COMPOSITE EDUCATIONAL NEEDS . . . . . .
School Board. . . . . .
Educators . . . . . .
Students. . . . . .
Citizens. . . . . .
Urban . . . . . .
Rural . . . . . .
Remote Rural. . . . . .
Summary . . . . . .
IV. CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS. . . . . .
Conclusions . . . . . .
Implications. . . . . .
Implications for Educational Policy . . . . .
Implications for Educational Research . . . .
APPENDIX A: Respondent Chosen for Interview in Nevada
APPENDIX B: Interview Instrument . . . . . .

PAGE

ms 49
n 54
. 58
. 59
. 61
. 63
. 65
. 67
. 67
. 69
. 72
. 74
. 78
. 78
. 81
. 81
Policy 83
Research 86
erview in Nevada Educational Needs Study. . 89
. . . . . .

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE PAGE

I. Educational Needs by Subject Fields: Percents, Averages, and Ranks of School Boards, Educators, Students, Citizens, and the Total Sample 12

II. Educational Needs by Subject Fields: Percents, Averages, and Ranks of Urban Samples, Rural Samples, Remote Rural Samples and the Total Sample 13

III. Educational Needs by Level of Education: Percents, Averages, and Ranks of School Boards, Educators, Students, Citizens, and the Total Sample 17

IV. Educational Needs by Level of Education: Percents, Averages, and Ranks of Urban Samples, Rural Samples, Remote Rural Samples and the Total Sample 18

V. Educational Needs for Pre-Vocational and Occupational Programs: Percents, Averages, and Ranks of School Boards, Educators, Students, Citizens, and the Total Sample. 22

VI. Educational Needs for Pre-Vocational and Occupational Programs: Percents, Averages, and Ranks of Urban Samples, Rural Samples, Remote Rural Samples and the Total Sample. 23

VII. Educational Needs related to Teacher Personnel: Percents, Averages, and Ranks of School Boards, Educators, Students, Citizens and the Total Sample 26

VIII. Educational Needs related to Teacher Personnel: Percents, Averages, and Ranks of Urban Samples, Rural Samples, Remote Rural Samples and the Total Sample 27

IX. Educational Needs for Administrative Services: Percents, Averages, and Ranks of School Boards, Educators, Students, Citizens, and the Total Sample 31

TABLE PAGE

X. Educational Needs for Administrative Services: Percents, Averages, and Ranks of Urban Samples, Rural Samples, Remote Rural Samples and the Total Sample 32

XI. Educational Needs for Pupil Services: Percents, Averages, and Ranks of School Boards, Educators, Students, Citizens, and the Total Sample 36

XII. Educational Needs for Pupil Services: Percents, Averages, and Ranks of Urban Samples, Rural Samples, Remote Rural Samples and the Total Sample 37

XIII. Educational Needs for Budget Allocations: Percents, Averages, and Ranks of School Boards, Educators, Students, Citizens, and the Total Sample 41

XIV. Educational Needs for Budget Allocations: Percents, Averages, and Ranks of Urban Samples, Rural Samples, Remote Rural Samples and the Total Sample 42

XV. Educational Needs by Instructional Approaches: Percents, Averages, and Ranks of School Boards, Educators, Students, Citizens, and the Total Sample 46

XVI. Educational Needs by Instructional Approaches: Percents, Averages, and Ranks of Urban Samples, Rural Samples, Remote Rural Samples and the Total Sample 47

XVII. Educational Needs for Educational Programs: Percents, Averages, and Ranks of School Boards, Educators, Students, Citizens, and the Total Sample 51

TABLE PAGE

XVIII. Educational Needs for Educational Programs: Percents, Averages, and Ranks of Urban Samples, Rural Samples, Remote Rural Samples and the Total Sample 52

XIX. Educational Needs for In-Service Education: Percents, Averages, and Ranks of School Boards, Educators, Students, Citizens, and the Total Sample 55

XX. Educational Needs for In-Service Education: Percents, Averages, and Ranks of Urban Samples, Rural Samples, Remote Rural Samples and the Total Sample 56

XXI. Composite Ranking of Perceived Educational Needs in All Categories by the Total Sample. 60

XXII. Composite Ranking of Perceived Educational Needs in All Categories by the School Board Sample 62

XXIII. Composite Ranking of Perceived Educational Needs in All Categories by the Sample of Educators 64

XXIV. Composite Ranking of Perceived Educational Needs in All Categories by the Sample of Students. 66

XXV. Composite Ranking of Perceived Educational Needs in All Categories by the Sample of Citizens. 68

XXVI. Composite Ranking of Perceived Educational Needs in All Categories by the Urban Sample. 70

XXVII. Composite Ranking of Perceived Educational Needs in All Categories by the Rural Sample. 71

XXVIII. Composite Ranking of Perceived Educational Needs in All Categories by the Remote Rural Sample 73

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE		PAGE
1.	Respondent Roles.	8
2.	Assignment of Respondents by Geographic Areas	8
3.	Ranking of Subject Fields by All Groups and Geographic Areas.	14
4.	Ranking of Levels of Education by All Groups and Geographic Areas	19
5.	Ranking of Pre-Vocational and Occupational Programs by All Groups and Geographic Areas.	24
6.	Ranking of Teacher Personnel Concerns by All Groups and Geographic Areas. .	28
7.	Ranking of Administrative Services by All Groups and Geographic Areas . . .	33
8.	Ranking of Pupil Services by All Groups and Geographic Areas.	38
9.	Ranking of Budget Allocations by All Groups and Geographic Areas.	43
10.	Ranking of Instructional Approaches by All Groups and Geographic Areas. . .	48
11.	Ranking of Educational Programs by All Groups and Geographic Areas.	53
12.	Ranking of In-Service Education by All Groups and Geographic Areas.	57
13.	Summary of Imperative Needs by All Groups and Geographic Areas.	75

CHAPTE

OBJECTIVES AND DESI

This study is the second in a series
in the State of Nevada. The 1969 State As
of existing data and was the first phase i
mation system for the continuous assessmen

This 1970 study was conducted under t
and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (as ame
commissioned the Research and Educational P
versity of Nevada to conduct this statewide
was patterned closely after the 1969 "Wisco

Purpose of the Study and P

The general purpose of the study was t
needs in the State of Nevada. Such informat
tool in assisting the State Department of Ed
in the State in program planning and in the

Information was sought to aid in answer

1. What are the imperative educational
board members, educators, students,

CHAPTER I

ES AND DESIGN OF THE STUDY

n a series designed to assess the status of education
69 State Assessment of Education presented an analysis
rst phase in the plan to implement a statewide infor-
s assessment and evaluation of educational programs.
ted under the provisions of Title III of the Elementary
1965 (as amended). The State Department of Education
ducational Planning Center, College of Education, Uni-
is statewide educational needs assessment. This study
1969 "Wisconsin Educational Needs Assessment Study."

Study and Problems Investigated

study was to determine the imperative educational
Such information should be of value as a management
artment of Education and other policy making agencies
g and in the allocation of funds.

aid in answering the following specific questions:

e educational needs in Nevada as perceived by school
rs, students, and selected citizens?

2. What priorities are assigned to specific and composite educational needs in the State of Nevada?

3. How are the need priorities distributed in the Urban, Rural, and Remote Rural areas of the State?

Procedures of the Study

Since it was the desire of the State Department to replicate the 1969 Wisconsin Study, several preliminary meetings were held between State Department and Research and Educational Planning Center personnel in order to adjust the procedures of the Wisconsin Study to the State of Nevada. Strategies for sampling methods, choice of respondents within each school district, adjustment of the interview instrument, and procedures to be used to gather and process the data were carefully planned.

School Districts Included in the Study

In order for State Department staff to be able to identify regional and state-wide educational needs, the criteria used in the 1969 Nevada assessment were applied in this study. (See Education in Nevada: An Assessment, 1969, pp. 3-5.)

In essence, the geographic areas included are Urban, Rural, and Remote Rural. Those districts with less than three hundred students in grades nine through twelve are classified as Remote Rural districts. All of the rest of the districts of the State are designated as Rural except Clark and Washoe County school districts which are designated as Urban.

Respondent Groups

The selection of the sample population followed the types of respondent groups used in the Wisconsin Study. These four groups included the following types of individuals: school board members, professional educators, students, and citizens.

School board members were included because of the importance of their decision making role in matters concerning educational policies in the State. Two board members in each district were selected for interview: the board president, who usually has considerable experience, and the newest board member, who would reflect the more recent concerns expressed by constituents.[1]

Since "professional educators" is not a homogeneous grouping, respondents were sought from both administrative and teaching ranks. It was decided to interview the superintendent of schools in each of the districts, a random choice of principals or vice-principals, and teachers chosen randomly within each district.[2]

Student opinions were sought from seniors scheduled to graduate in 1970, and these students were randomly selected in each district.

The citizen group included an elected official, the president of the parent-teacher organization, and a member of the press--a reporter or editor.

---

[1] Wisconsin Educational Needs Assessment Study, Department of Public Instruction, Madison, Wisconsin, 1969, p. 5.

[2] Ibid.

The sampling of the Nevada population was per
lowing types and numbers of individuals:

School board members

Educators

Students

Citizens

Total

These groups were selected in accordance with
sampling techniques from each of their respective p
people are arranged according to the type of geogra

Urban

Rural

Remote Rural

Total

The types of respondents in each of these grou

The Interview Instrument

The interview instrument used in this study w
in the 1969 Wisconsin Study. This instrument, rep
structured approach, in which the respondent was as
alternatives supplied to him. This approach was mo

vada population was performed so as to provide the fol-
individuals:

chool board members	38
ducators	208
tudents	93
itizens	112
Total	451

cted in accordance with generally accepted statistical
ch of their respective populations. When these selected
ng to the type of geographic locality, the results are:

Urban	120
Rural	235
Remote Rural	96
Total	451

nts in each of these groups are listed in Appendix A.

ment used in this study was, with few revisions, the one used
dy. This instrument, reproduced in Appendix B, used a
hich the respondent was asked to choose from among a range of
him. This approach was more meaningful to the interviewees

as it identified needs and established priorities among nee
this format was easily coded and amenable to computer proce

The interview instrument as developed allowed for two
During the first phase, the interviewer spread out in front
cards on which were listed the ten items of each of the cat
was instructed to establish his priorities within each cate
from "most additional emphasis" to "least additional emphas
times until each of the categories had been ranked.

After each set of cards had been arranged the intervie
priority card and set it aside. When the interviewee had c
ten first priority cards had been separated, the second pha
initiated. Respondents were asked to rank-order the ten it
signed number one priority in each of the ten categories.
of educational needs was obtained.

The use of these sets of cards was found to be conveni
and the interviewee and eliminated the possible dilemma of

---

[3]Wisconsin, op. cit., pp. 7-8.

established priorities among needs. The data yielded by
ed and amenable to computer processing.[3]
ent as developed allowed for two phases in each interview.
e interviewer spread out in front of the respondent ten
the ten items of each of the categories. The interviewee
h his priorities within each category by arranging the cards
nasis" to "least additional emphasis." This was repeated ten
ategories had been ranked.
rds had been arranged the interviewer pulled the number one
aside. When the interviewee had completed all sets, and the
had been separated, the second phase of the interview was
ere asked to rank-order the ten items to which he had as-
y in each of the ten categories. Thus, a composite ranking
obtained.
s of ca[illegible] was found to be convenient for the interviewer
eliminated the possible dilemma of tied ranks.

t., pp. 7-8.

Training of the Interviewers and Gathering of the

Because of the distances between the various
cided to use two teams of interviewers. One tea
State, and the other interviewed in the southern

Intensive training sessions were conducted
training session with the northern team, a sub-c
personnel was in attendance in order to be a par
clarify statements in the interview instrument.

The interviewers were given a complete brie
of the Study, including a briefing by Dr. James
Study. They were then given interview kits whic
and materials necessary to record the ranking of
the interviewers were asked to go through the co
they did not fully understand. They were then a
other, again noting all questions. After these
the opportunity to direct these questions to the
ment.

As a result of the questions raised by the
made in the interview instrument and interview g
State Department sub-committee, an identical tra
southern team.

Gathering of the Data

ween the various districts of the State, it was de-
ewers. One team covered the northern part of the
in the southern part of the State.
were conducted for these teams. During the first
n team, a sub-committee of the State Department
der to be a part of the interview training and to
ew instrument.
a complete briefing on the background and purpose
g by Dr. James Lipham, director of the Wisconsin
rview kits which included a guide, ten sets of cards
the ranking of the cards. After a demonstration,
through the complete interview, noting any items
hey were then asked to practice interviewing each
. After these practice sessions, they were given
uestions to the sub-committee of the State Depart-

raised by the interview team, some revisions were
and interview guide. Except for the presence of the
n identical training session was held for the

The interview team then conducted a pilot testing of the instrument and procedures of the interview. Only minor changes were made.

Treatment of the Data

The interview data were coded and keypunched by Research and Educational Planning Center personnel. Each interview was represented by two punched cards, and the two cards for each interview were coded so that the county, role of respondent, and card sequence could be easily identified. The cards were computer edited to insure that the completed data were logically consistent with the interview instrument.

The coding procedure provided for simple data partitioning. The respondents were divided in two ways: first by the role of the respondent which resulted in four groups, each of which consisted of one or more respondent roles. See Figure 1.

The second division of respondents was by the county of the respondent which generated three groups, each of which contained several counties. This is illustrated in Figure 2.

		Roles
Group I:	School Boards	Board Presidents Newest Board Members
Group II:	Educators	Central Administrators Principals Teachers
Group III:	Students	Senior Students
Group IV:	Citizens	Elected Public Officials Press P.T.A. Employment Security

Figure 1. Respondent Roles

		Counties	
Group I:	Urban	Clark	Washoe
Group II:	Rural	Carson City Churchill Douglas Elko	Humboldt Lyon Mineral White Pine
Group III:	Remote Rural	Esmeralda Eureka Lander Lincoln	Nye Pershing Storey

Figure 2. Assignment of Respondents by Geographic Areas

Summary

In this chapter the objectives and procedures of the study have been reported. In Chapter II, the results of the treatment of the data by specific educational needs will be presented: in Chapter III, a further analysis of data shows the composite ranking of educational needs. Conclusions and implications of the study are reported in Chapter IV.

CHAPTER II

SPECIFIC EDUCATIONAL NEEDS

In order to determine the most imperative educational needs in the State of Nevada, respondents were asked to rank 100 needs; ten in each of ten categories, according to the amount of additional emphasis they felt each need should receive. In this chapter the results of these rankings by school board members, educators, students, and citizens are examined.

These groups were then divided into the geographic areas -- Urban, Rural, and Remote Rural -- represented by each of the respondents, and a second analysis of responses is reported.

A narrative and graphic reporting of the findings of the interviews are given in each of the following categories: Subject Fields, Level of Education, Vocational-Technical Programs, Teacher Personnel, Administrative Services, Pupil Services, Budget Allocations, Instructional Approaches, Educational Programs, and In-Service Education.

Category I: Subject Fields

Of all the Subject Fields, Reading was ranked by all groups of respondents as the subject needing the most additional emphasis. English (Language Arts) was

second for all groups except Citizens who ranked Mathematics (Arithmetic, Algebra, etc.) second. The average ranking of all groups placed Mathematics (Arithmetic, Algebra, etc.) third; Science (General Science, Biology, etc.), fourth; Vocational-Technical (Office, Agricultural, etc.), fifth; Social Studies (History, Geography, Government, etc.), sixth; Industrial and Practical Arts (General Shop, Homemaking, etc.), seventh; Fine Arts (Music, Art, Drama), eighth; Physical Education, Health and Safety Education, ninth; and Foreign Languages, tenth.

Generally, respondent groups were in agreement on their ranking of the Subject Fields (see Table I). The priority assignments of Citizens and Students differed somewhat from the total picture: Citizens gave a higher priority to Social Studies and a lower priority to the Fine Arts, and Students ranked Industrial and Practical Arts lower and Foreign Languages higher than the overall average. Figure 3 illustrates how the pattern of priorities was repeated by the geographic areas.

It is to be noted that the Remote Rural areas also gave a higher priority to Foreign Languages (Table II).

Clearly Reading is considered the most imperative Subject Field need in the State of Nevada.

TABLE I

EDUCATIONAL NEEDS BY SUBJECT FIELDS: PERCENTS, AVE
SCHOOL BOARDS, EDUCATORS, STUDENTS, CITIZENS, AND

SUBJECT FIELDS	SCHOOL BOARDS (N = 38)			EDUCATORS (N = 208)			PE
	PER-CENT*	AVER-AGE	RANK	PER-CENT	AVER-AGE	RANK	CE
Reading (Skills, Comprehension, etc.)	76.32	1.84	1	63.94	2.03	1	22
English (Language Arts)	5.26	3.37	2	5.29	3.76	2	18
Mathematics (Arithmetic, Algebra, etc.)	2.63	3.58	3	3.85	4.43	3	6
Science (General Science, Biology, etc.)	2.63	5.08	4	0.96	5.67	5	7
Vocational-Technical (Office, Agricultural, etc.)	10.53	5.21	5	13.94	5.42	4	9
Social Studies (History, Geography, Government, etc.)	0.00	5.95	6	1.92	5.88	7	5
Industrial & Practical Arts (General Shop, Homemaking, etc.)	2.63	6.13	7	5.77	5.76	6	1
Fine Arts (Music, Art, Drama)	0.00	7.55	8	1.92	6.93	8	13
Physical Education, Health and Safety Education	0.00	8.24	10	2.40	7.09	9	4
Foreign Languages	0.00	8.05	9	0.00	8.02	10	10

* This represents the percent of respondents ranking a given item numb

ERCENTS, AVERAGES, AND RANKS OF
ITIZENS, AND THE TOTAL SAMPLE

ATORS = 208)		STUDENTS (N = 93)			CITIZENS (N = 112)			TOTAL (N = 451)		
VER-AGE	RANK	PER-CENT	AVER-AGE	RANK	PER-CENT	AVER-AGE	RANK	PER-CENT	AVER-AGE	RANK
2.03	1	22.58	3.70	1	48.21	2.49	1	52.55	2.47	1
3.76	2	18.28	4.81	2	14.29	3.58	3	10.20	3.90	2
4.43	3	6.45	5.01	4	9.82	3.36	2	5.76	4.21	3
5.67	5	7.53	4.96	3	4.46	5.27	5	3.33	5.37	4
5.42	4	9.68	5.45	6	8.93	5.53	6	11.53	5.44	5
5.88	7	5.38	5.74	7	1.79	5.24	4	2.44	5.70	6
5.76	6	1.08	6.42	9	7.14	6.08	7	4.88	6.01	7
6.93	8	13.98	6.39	8	2.68	8.09	10	4.43	7.16	8
7.09	9	4.30	7.09	10	1.79	7.49	8	2.44	7.28	9
8.02	10	10.75	5.44	5	0.89	7.88	9	2.44	7.46	10

iven item number 1.

TABLE II

EDUCATIONAL NEEDS BY SUBJECT FIELDS: PERCENTS, AVERAGES, AND RANKS OF URBAN SAMPLES, RURAL SAMPLES, REMOTE RURAL SAMPLES, AND THE TOTAL SAMPLE

SUBJECT FIELDS	URBAN (N = 120)			RURAL (N = 235)			REMOTE RURAL (N = 96)			TOTAL (N = 451)		
	PER-CENT*	AVER-AGE	RANK	PER-CENT	AVER-AGE	RANK	PER-CENT	AVER-AGE	RANK	PER-CENT	AVER-AGE	RANK
ding ills, Comprehension, etc.)	58.33	2.24	1	51.06	2.40	1	48.96	2.95	1	52.55	2.47	1
glish nguage Arts)	6.67	3.73	2	11.91	4.00	2	10.42	3.86	2	10.20	3.90	2
thematics rithmetic, Algebra, etc.)	5.00	4.21	3	5.11	4.33	3	8.33	3.94	3	5.76	4.21	3
ience (General Science, ology, etc.)	5.83	5.05	4	1.70	5.58	5	4.17	5.27	4	3.33	5.37	4
cational-Technical ffice, Agricultural, etc.)	10.00	5.61	6	12.77	5.38	4	10.42	5.35	5	11.53	5.44	5
cial Studies (History, ography, Government, etc.)	3.33	5.07	5	2.55	5.83	6	1.04	6.16	7	2.44	5.70	6
dustrial & Practical Arts eneral Shop, Homemaking, etc.)	4.17	6.21	7	4.26	6.06	7	7.29	5.64	6	4.88	6.01	7
ne Arts Music, Art, Drama)	0.83	7.55	9	5.53	6.92	8	6.25	7.25	9	4.43	7.16	8
ysical Education, Health nd Safety Education	3.33	7.18	8	2.13	7.30	10	2.08	7.39	10	2.44	7.28	9
oreign Languages	2.50	8.16	10	2.98	7.20	9	1.04	7.20	8	2.44	7.46	10

* This represents the percent of respondents ranking a given item number 1.

Subject Fields	School Boards	Educators	Students	Citizens	Ave. Rank	Urban	Rural	Remote Rural	Ave. Rank
Reading	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
English	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	2	2
Mathematics	3	3	4	2	3	3	3	3	3
Science	4	5	3	5	4	4	5	4	4
Vocational-Technical	5	4	6	6	5	6	4	5	5
Social Studies	6	7	7	4	6	5	6	7	6
Industrial & Practical Arts	7	6	9	7	7	7	7	6	7
Fine Arts	8	8	8	10	8	9	8	9	8
Physical Education, Health and Safety Education	10	9	10	8	9	8	10	10	9
Foreign Languages	9	10	5	9	10	10	9	8	10

Figure 3. Ranking of Subject Fields by All Groups and Geographic Areas

Category II: Level of Education

In order to determine at which level of education t
needed, the sample population was asked to rank ten lev
ment among the groups in assigning priorities to these

While the average rank for all groups places the Ju
as the first priority, none of the groups ranked this le
tion (Grades 1-3) was ranked second by average rank, ho
level sixth and Students ranked it ninth. Except for S
closer agreement in third place Post-Secondary Vocation
siderable differences among the groups in placing Senio
fourth rank: Students and Citizens rated this level as
for the fifth-placed level was the Intermediate Level,
this level first priority and Students ranked it seventh

With continued differences among the groups, Commun
given an average rank of sixth position; Kindergarten,
eighth; Early Childhood, ninth; and University Educatio

These data, as illustrated in Table III, clearly sh
among the groups. Priority of needs by level of educat
assign.

II: Level of Education

ich level of education the most additional emphasis is
as asked to rank ten levels. There was little agree-
ing priorities to these levels.
all groups places the Junior High School (Grades 7-9)
the groups ranked this level first. Primary Educa-
cond by average rank, however, Citizens ranked this
it ninth. Except for School Boards, groups were in
Post-Secondary Vocational-Technical. There were con-
groups in placing Senior High School in an overall
zens rated this level as first priority. The average
the Intermediate Level, however, School Boards gave
tudents ranked it seventh.
among the groups, Community College Education was
position; Kindergarten, seventh; Adult Education,
and University Education, tenth.
in Table III, clearly show the lack of agreement
needs by level of education would be difficult to

As with the respondent groups, none of the geographic areas placed the Junior High School in first position. Both Urban and Remote Rural areas gave the highest priority to the Primary level. These areas, Urban and Remote Rural, tended to be in closer agreement in assigning a rank order to Levels of Education than the Rural area (Table IV).

The priority assignments of all groups and geographic areas as shown in Figure 4 illustrates further this lack of agreement.

TABLE III

EDUCATIONAL NEEDS BY LEVEL OF EDUCATION: PERCENTS, AVERAGES,
SCHOOL BOARDS, EDUCATORS, STUDENTS, CITIZENS, AND THE TOT

LEVEL OF EDUCATION	SCHOOL BOARDS (N = 38)			EDUCATORS (N = 208)			STUDEN (N = 9	
	PER-CENT*	AVER-AGE	RANK	PER-CENT	AVER-AGE	RANK	PER-CENT	AVE AG
Junior High School Education (Grades 7-9)	10.53	4.13	3	5.77	5.00	4	9.68	4.9
Primary Education (Grades 1-3)	21.05	4.03	2	26.92	4.04	1	9.68	6.3
Post-Secondary Vocational-Technical Education	15.79	5.29	5	15.38	4.92	3	7.53	5.0
Senior High School Education (Grades 9-12)	7.89	4.42	4	7.21	5.39	6	10.75	4.8
Intermediate Level Education (Grades 4-6)	5.26	3.97	1	2.40	4.79	2	4.30	5.5
Community College Education	5.26	6.55	8	5.29	6.42	9	5.38	5.4
Kindergarten Education (5 Year-olds)	10.53	6.16	6	7.21	5.03	5	3.23	6.7
Adult Education	5.26	6.66	9	6.25	6.23	8	11.83	4.9
Early Childhood (3-4 Year Olds)	13.16	7.24	10	20.19	5.64	7	16.13	6.1
University Education	5.26	6.55	7	3.37	7.54	10	21.51	5.1

* This represents the percent of respondents ranking a given item number 1.

TABLE III

ATION: PERCENTS, AVERAGES, AND RANKS OF
ENTS, CITIZENS, AND THE TOTAL SAMPLE

EDUCATORS (N = 208)			STUDENTS (N = 93)			CITIZENS (N = 112)			TOTAL (N = 451)		
ER-ENT	AVER-AGE	RANK	PER-CENT	AVER-AGE	RANK	PER-CENT	AVER-AGE	RANK	PER-CENT	AVER-AGE	RANK
5.77	5.00	4	9.68	4.99	3	10.71	4.66	2	8.20	4.84	1
6.92	4.04	1	9.68	6.31	9	9.82	5.54	6	18.63	4.88	2
5.38	4.92	3	7.53	5.02	4	19.64	4.71	3	14.86	4.92	3
7.21	5.39	6	10.75	4.81	1	4.46	4.46	1	7.32	4.96	4
2.40	4.79	2	4.30	5.58	7	8.93	5.13	5	4.66	4.97	5
5.29	6.42	9	5.38	5.43	6	16.07	4.90	4	7.98	5.85	6
7.21	5.03	5	3.23	6.70	10	6.25	6.67	9	6.43	5.88	7
6.25	6.23	8	11.83	4.91	2	4.46	5.83	7	6.87	5.89	8
20.19	5.64	7	16.13	6.12	8	9.82	7.17	10	16.19	6.25	9
3.37	7.54	10	21.51	5.13	5	9.82	5.93	8	8.37	6.56	10

g a given item number 1.

TABLE IV

EDUCATIONAL NEEDS BY LEVEL OF EDUCATION: PERCENTS, AVERAGES, AND RANKS OF URBAN SAMPLES, RURAL SAMPLES, REMOTE RURAL SAMPLES, AND THE TOTAL SAMPLE

LEVEL OF EDUCATION	URBAN (N = 120)			RURAL (N = 235)			REMOTE RURAL (N = 96)			TOTAL (N = 451)		
	PER-CENT*	AVER-AGE	RANK	PER-CENT	AVER-AGE	RANK	PER-CENT	AVER-AGE	RANK	PER-CENT	AVER-AGE	RANK
Junior High School Education (Grades 7-9)	8.33	4.57	3	8.94	4.97	3	6.25	4.85	2	8.20	4.84	1
Primary Education (Grades 1-3)	25.83	4.14	1	15.74	5.33	5	16.67	4.70	1	18.63	4.88	2
Post-Secondary Vocational-Technical Education	12.50	5.24	5	20.00	4.59	1	5.21	5.31	5	14.86	4.92	3
Senior High School Education (Grades 9-12)	3.33	4.95	4	10.64	4.84	2	4.17	5.27	4	7.32	4.96	4
Intermediate Level Education (Grades 4-6)	6.67	4.49	2	2.98	5.23	4	6.25	4.92	3	4.66	4.97	5
Community College Education	1.67	6.27	8	12.77	5.41	7	4.17	6.41	10	7.98	5.85	6
Kindergarten Education (5 Year Olds)	5.00	5.53	6	3.83	6.19	8	14.58	5.54	6	6.43	5.88	7
Adult Education	2.50	7.11	10	6.81	5.41	6	12.50	5.56	7	6.87	5.89	8
Early Childhood (3-4 Year Olds)	23.33	5.80	7	12.34	6.49	9	16.67	6.23	9	16.19	6.25	9
University Education	10.83	6.90	9	5.96	6.53	10	13.54	6.21	8	8.87	6.56	10

* This represents the percent of respondents ranking a given item number 1.

Grade Levels	School Boards	Educators	Students	Citizens	Ave. Rank	Urban	Rural	Remote Rural	Ave. Rank
unior High School Education	3	4	3	2	1	3	3	2	1
rimary Education	2	1	9	6	2	1	5	1	2
ost-Secondary Vocational-Technical Education	5	3	4	3	3	5	1	5	3
enior High School Education	4	6	1	1	4	4	2	4	4
ntermediate Level Education	1	2	7	5	5	2	4	3	5
ommunity College	8	9	6	4	6	8	7	10	6
indergarten Education	6	5	10	9	7	6	8	6	7
dult Education	9	8	2	7	8	10	6	7	8
arly Childhood	10	7	8	10	9	7	9	9	9
niversity Education	7	10	5	8	10	9	10	8	10

Figure 4. Ranking of Levels of Education by All Groups and Geographic Areas

Category III: Pre-Vocational and Occupat

In order to determine the kinds of Vocational Prog
Nevada schools, opinions were sought regarding ten type
pational Programs. The results of the ratings of the r
Table V.

In this category, Educators and Students were mos
or below the average rank order for all groups. Trade
(Building Trades, Automotive, etc.) was given first pr
tion (General Business, Business Exploratory, etc.), se
(Electronics, Radio, T.V., etc.), third; Office Occupat
Clerical, etc.), fourth; Health Occupations Education
fifth; Industrial Arts (Exploratory, General Shop, etc.
and Child Care Services, etc.), seventh; Distributive E
Sales, etc.), eighth; Consumer and Homemaking (Buying,
Vocational Agriculture (Off-Farm, Production, etc.), te

It is interesting to note that while Educators and
from the overall rankings in this category, in Health O
they differed most from each other.

Pre-Vocational and Occupational Programs

he kinds of Vocational Programs which are most needed in
e sought regarding ten types of Pre-Vocational and Occu-
lts of the ratings of the respondent groups are shown in

ators and Students were most often two or more ranks above
rder for all groups. Trade and Industrial Education
e, etc.) was given first priority; Basic Business Educa-
iness Exploratory, etc.), second; Technical Education
etc.), third; Office Occupations Education (Secretarial,
alth Occupations Education (Nursing, Health Aides, etc.),
loratory, General Shop, etc.), sixth; Home Economics (Food
c.), seventh; Distributive Education (Merchandising,
mer and Homemaking (Buying, Clothing, etc.), ninth; and
-Farm, Production, etc.), tenth.

ote that while Educators and Students most often deviated
n this category, in Health Occupations and Industrial Arts
h other.

Comparisons of the rank order of the groups and geographic areas is shown in Figure 5. Of the geographic areas, rankings of the Remote Rural areas differed most from the average rankings (see Table VI).

TABLE V

EDUCATIONAL NEEDS FOR PRE-VOCATIONAL AND OCCUPATIONAL PR
AND RANKS OF SCHOOL BOARDS, EDUCATORS, STUDENTS, CITIZ

PRE-VOCATIONAL AND OCCUPATIONAL PROGRAMS	SCHOOL BOARDS (N = 38)			EDUCATORS (N = 208)			P
	PER-CENT*	AVER-AGE	RANK	PER-CENT	AVER-AGE	RANK	C
Trade & Industrial Education (Bldg. Trades, Automotive, etc.)	31.58	3.42	1	21.15	3.91	1	
Basic Business Education (Gen. Bus., Bus. Exploratory, etc.)	23.68	4.24	3	8.65	5.33	5	1
Technical Education (Electronics, Radio, T.V., etc.)	10.53	4.18	2	15.38	5.17	3	2
Office Occupations Education (Secretarial, Clerical, etc.)	5.26	4.66	4	6.73	5.23	4	
Health Occupations Education (Nursing, Health Aides, etc.)	5.26	5.53	6	8.65	5.84	8	2
Industrial Arts (Exploratory, General Shop, etc.)	7.89	4.92	5	9.13	5.10	2	
Home Economics (Food and Child Care Services, etc.)	5.26	6.42	7	9.13	5.62	6	
Distributive Education (Merchandising, Sales, etc.)	2.63	6.79	8	5.29	5.87	9	
Consumer and Homemaking (Buying, Clothing, etc.)	2.63	7.11	9	11.54	5.62	7	
Vocational Agricultural (Off-Farm, Production, etc.)	5.26	7.74	10	4.33	7.32	10	

* This represents the percent of respondents ranking a given item num

TABLE V

VOCATIONAL AND OCCUPATIONAL PROGRAMS: PERCENTS, AVERAGES, RDS, EDUCATORS, STUDENTS, CITIZENS, AND THE TOTAL SAMPLE

OL BOARDS = 38)		EDUCATORS (N = 208)			STUDENTS (N = 93)			CITIZENS (N = 112)			TOTAL (N = 451)		
AVER-AGE	RANK	PER-CENT	AVER-AGE	RANK	PER-CENT	AVER-AGE	RANK	PER-CENT	AVER-AGE	RANK	PER-CENT	AVER-AGE	RANK
3.42	1	21.15	3.91	1	9.68	4.72	3	29.46	3.38	1	21.73	3.90	1
4.24	3	8.65	5.33	5	11.83	4.91	4	25.00	3.78	2	14.63	4.77	2
4.18	2	15.38	5.17	3	20.43	4.34	2	4.46	5.02	4	13.30	4.88	3
4.66	4	6.73	5.23	4	7.53	5.53	5	8.04	4.50	3	7.10	5.06	4
5.53	6	8.65	5.84	8	22.58	4.23	1	10.71	5.29	5	11.75	5.34	5
4.92	5	9.13	5.10	2	2.15	6.74	10	4.46	6.14	7	6.43	5.68	6
6.42	7	9.13	5.62	6	7.53	6.15	7	8.93	6.04	6	8.43	5.90	7
6.79	8	5.29	5.87	9	6.45	5.59	6	0.00	6.94	9	3.99	6.15	8
7.11	9	11.54	5.62	7	3.23	6.58	9	4.46	7.13	10	7.32	6.31	9
7.74	10	4.33	7.32	10	8.60	6.20	8	4.46	6.79	8	5.32	6.99	10

ondents ranking a given item number 1.

TABLE

EDUCATIONAL NEEDS FOR PRE-VOCATIONAL AND OCC
RANKS OF URBAN SAMPLES, RURAL SAMPLES, REMO

PRE-VOCATIONAL AND OCCUPATIONAL PROGRAMS	URBAN (N = 120) PER-CENT*	AVER-AGE	RAN
Trade & Industrial Education (Bldg. Trades, Automotive, etc.)	15.00	4.32	1
Basic Business Education (Gen. Bus., Bus. Exploratory, etc.)	18.33	4.48	2
Technical Education (Electronics, Radio, T.V., etc.)	12.50	4.81	3
Office Occupations Education (Secretarial, Clerical, etc.)	4.17	5.18	4
Health Occupations Education (Nursing, Health Aides, etc.)	14.17	5.20	5
Industrial Arts (Exploratory, General Shop, etc.)	7.50	5.59	7
Home Economics (Food and Child Care Services, etc.)	11.67	5.48	6
Distributive Education (Merchandising, Sales, etc.)	5.00	6.10	9
Consumer and Homemaking (Buying, Clothing, etc.)	10.00	5.79	8
Vocational Agriculture (Off-Farm, Production, etc.)	1.67	8.06	10

* This represents the percent of respondents ranking

TABLE VI

CATIONAL AND OCCUPATIONAL PROGRAMS: PERCENTS, AVERAGES,
AL SAMPLES, REMOTE RURAL SAMPLES, AND THE TOTAL SAMPLE

URBAN (N = 120)			RURAL (N = 235)			REMOTE RURAL (N = 96)			TOTAL (N = 451)		
PER-CENT*	AVER-AGE	RANK	PER-CENT	AVER-AGE	RANK	PER-CENT	AVER-AGE	RANK	PER-CENT	AVER-AGE	RANK
15.00	4.32	1	21.70	3.77	1	30.21	3.71	1	21.73	3.90	1
18.33	4.48	2	15.32	4.79	2	8.33	5.08	3	14.63	4.77	2
12.50	4.81	3	12.77	4.86	3	15.63	5.03	2	13.30	4.88	3
4.17	5.18	4	10.21	4.95	4	3.13	5.19	4	7.10	5.06	4
14.17	5.20	5	10.21	5.32	5	12.50	5.57	7	11.75	5.34	5
7.50	5.59	7	5.11	5.80	6	8.33	5.50	6	6.43	5.68	6
11.67	5.48	6	6.81	6.36	8	8.33	5.30	5	8.43	5.90	7
5.00	6.10	9	4.68	5.85	7	1.04	6.97	10	3.99	6.15	8
10.00	5.79	8	5.53	6.53	9	8.33	6.45	9	7.32	6.31	9
1.67	8.06	10	7.66	6.77	10	4.17	6.20	8	5.32	6.99	10

pondents ranking a given item number 1.

Pre-Vocational and Occupational Programs	School Boards	Educators	Students	Citizens	Ave. Rank	Urban	Rural	Remote Rural	Ave. Rank
Trade & Industrial Education	1	1	3	1	1	1	1	1	1
Basic Business Education	3	5	4	2	2	2	2	3	2
Technical Education	2	3	2	4	3	3	3	2	3
Office Occupations Education	4	4	5	3	4	4	4	4	4
Health Occupations Education	6	8	1	5	5	5	5	7	5
Industrial Arts	5	2	10	7	6	7	6	6	6
Home Economics	7	6	7	6	7	6	8	5	7
Distributive Education	8	9	6	9	8	9	7	10	8
Consumer and Homemaking	9	7	9	10	9	8	9	9	9
Vocational Agriculture	10	10	8	8	10	10	10	8	10

Figure 5. Ranking of Pre-Vocational and Occupational Program by All Groups and Geographic Areas

Category IV: Teacher Personnel Concerns

All groups gave first priority to the Quality of Teacher Candidates as an expression of concern regarding teacher personnel, and all groups agreed that Teacher Militancy was the matter of least concern. Evaluation of Teachers was second; Teacher Utilization and Specialization, third; Ineffective Teachers, fourth; Methods of Teacher Selection, fifth; Teacher Involvement in Decision Making, sixth; Teacher Salaries, seventh; Supply of Teacher Candidates, eighth; and Teacher Turnover, ninth.

As shown in Table VII, Educators and Students were less concerned with Evaluation of Teachers than were School Boards and Citizens. Educators and Students were more concerned with Teacher Utilization and Specialization. Educators were much less concerned with Methods of Teacher Selection than were Students and Citizens. Educators were more concerned than any other group with Teacher Involvement in Decision Making, and, of all groups, were the least concerned about the Supply of Teacher Candidates.

As further shown in Table VIII, the Remote Rural area differed in the assignment of needs more often than the other areas. Urban areas differed most from the average in the low priority given Teacher Utilization and Specialization, and a higher priority for Teacher Militancy.

Figure 6 illustrates the comparison of rankings among the respondent groups and the geographic areas.

TABLE VII

EDUCATIONAL NEEDS RELATED TO TEACHER PERSONNEL: PERCENTS, A
RANKS OF SCHOOL BOARDS, EDUCATORS, STUDENTS, CITIZENS, AND THE

TEACHER PERSONNEL CONCERNS	SCHOOL BOARDS (N = 38)			EDUCATORS (N = 208)			STU (N
	PER-CENT*	AVER-AGE	RANK	PER-CENT	AVER-AGE	RANK	PER-CENT
Quality of Teacher Candidates	26.32	3.18	1	16.35	3.93	1	16.13
Evaluation of Teachers	23.68	3.82	2	10.10	4.78	4	8.60
Teacher Utilization and Specialization	2.63	4.76	4	14.42	4.23	2	17.20
Ineffective Teachers	13.16	4.34	3	14.90	4.79	5	12.90
Methods of Teacher Selection	10.53	5.16	5	6.25	5.71	7	10.75
Teacher Involvement in Decision Making	0.00	7.05	9	17.31	4.59	3	5.38
Teacher Salaries	2.63	6.24	7	9.62	5.40	6	10.75
Supply of Teacher Candidates	10.53	5.97	6	3.85	6.83	9	10.75
Teacher Turnover	10.53	6.50	8	4.81	6.75	8	6.45
Teacher Militancy	0.00	7.97	10	2.40	8.00	10	1.08

* This represents the percent of respondents ranking a given item number 1

TABLE VII

TO TEACHER PERSONNEL: PERCENTS, AVERAGES, AND
CATORS, STUDENTS, CITIZENS, AND THE TOTAL SAMPLE

BOARDS 38)		EDUCATORS (N = 208)			STUDENTS (N = 93)			CITIZENS (N = 112)			TOTAL (N = 451)		
ER-GE	RANK	PER-CENT	AVER-AGE	RANK	PER-CENT	AVER-AGE	RANK	PER-CENT	AVER-AGE	RANK	PER-CENT	AVER-AGE	RANK
18	1	16.35	3.93	1	16.13	4.10	1	22.32	3.21	1	18.63	3.72	1
82	2	10.10	4.78	4	8.60	4.96	4	13.39	3.89	2	11.75	4.51	2
76	4	14.42	4.23	2	17.20	4.63	2	8.04	5.64	5	12.42	4.71	3
34	3	14.90	4.79	5	12.90	5.12	5	16.07	5.35	4	14.63	4.96	4
16	5	6.25	5.71	7	10.75	4.94	3	9.82	4.34	3	8.43	5.16	5
05	9	17.31	4.59	3	5.38	5.52	7	1.79	6.40	9	9.53	5.44	6
24	7	9.62	5.40	6	10.75	6.09	8	6.25	5.79	6	8.43	5.71	7
97	6	3.85	6.83	9	10.75	5.37	6	7.14	5.83	7	6.65	6.21	8
50	8	4.81	6.75	8	6.45	6.62	9	12.50	6.27	8	7.54	6.58	9
97	10	2.40	8.00	10	1.08	7.67	10	2.68	8.28	10	2.00	8.00	10

nts ranking a given item number 1.

TABLE VIII

EDUCATIONAL NEEDS RELATED TO TEACHER PERSONNEL: PERCENTS, AVERAGES, AND RANKS OF SCHOOL BOARDS, EDUCATORS, STUDENTS, CITIZENS, AND THE TOTAL SAMPLE

TEACHER PERSONNEL CONCERNS	URBAN (N = 120)			RURAL (N = 235)			REMOTE RURAL (N = 96)			TOTAL (N = 451)		
	PER-CENT*	AVER-AGE	RANK	PER-CENT	AVER-AGE	RANK	PER-CENT	AVER-AGE	RANK	PER-CENT	AVER-AGE	RANK
Quality of Teacher Candidates	15.00	3.53	1	17.02	3.92	1	27.08	3.47	1	18.63	3.72	1
Evaluation of Teachers	15.00	4.58	2	8.51	4.47	2	15.63	4.54	3	11.75	4.51	2
Teacher Utilization and Specialization	10.83	4.88	5	11.91	4.77	3	15.63	4.34	2	12.42	4.71	3
Ineffective Teachers	17.50	4.60	3	16.17	4.86	4	7.29	5.65	6	14.63	4.96	4
Methods of Teacher Selection	9.17	4.80	4	8.94	5.16	5	6.25	5.64	5	8.43	5.16	5
Teacher Involvement in Decision Making	11.67	4.93	6	11.49	5.49	6	2.08	5.94	8	9.53	5.44	6
Teacher Salaries	10.83	5.38	7	8.09	5.72	7	6.25	6.08	9	8.43	5.71	7
Supply of Teacher Candidates	1.67	7.55	9	8.09	5.92	8	9.38	5.22	4	6.65	6.21	8
Teacher Turnover	2.50	7.78	10	8.94	6.32	9	10.42	5.73	7	7.54	6.58	9
Teacher Militancy	5.83	6.97	8	0.85	8.36	10	0.00	8.40	10	2.00	8.00	10

* This represents the percent of respondents ranking a given item number 1.

Teacher Personnel Concerns	School Boards	Educators	Students	Citizens	Ave. Rank	Urban	Rural	Remote Rural	Ave. Rank
Quality of Teacher Candidates	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Evaluation of Teachers	2	4	4	2	2	2	2	3	2
Teacher Utilization and Specialization	4	2	2	5	3	5	3	2	3
Ineffective Teachers	3	5	5	4	4	3	4	6	4
Methods of Teacher Selection	5	7	3	3	5	4	5	5	5
Teacher Involvement in Decision Making	9	3	7	9	6	6	6	8	6
Teacher Salaries	7	6	8	6	7	7	7	9	7
Supply of Teacher Candidates	6	9	6	7	8	9	8	4	8
Teacher Turnover	8	8	9	8	9	10	9	7	9
Teacher Militancy	10	10	10	10	10	8	10	10	10

Figure 6. Ranking of Teacher Personnel Concerns by All Groups and Geographic Areas

Category V: Administrative Services

In the area of administrative services, Curriculum Development was given first priority by all groups except Students who ranked this third. Long-Range Program Planning was given an overall ranking of second, but Students and Citizens rated it sixth and fourth. The third rank was given to Pupil Personnel Services with major differences among the groups--School Boards ranked this as seventh, and Students ranked it first. There was more agreement among the groups regarding fourth-ranked School-Community Relations and fifth-ranked School Facility Planning.

There were differences among the groups with the overall ranking of Supervision of Instruction as sixth: School Boards and Citizens considered this the second area of concern and Educators ranked it eighth. Except for students, there was more agreement among the groups in ranking Research and Evaluation seventh. Staff Personnel Services was ranked eighth, with only Educators considering this of greater concern. There was unanimous agreement among the groups in assigning Business Management to ninth rank and Data Processing tenth. (Table IX)

On the whole, the assignment of needs by the geographic areas (Table X) resembles the overall rankings of the respondent groups. Rural areas were less concerned with School Community Relations and more concerned with Facilities than the average

of the groups, and Remote Rural areas were less concerned with Long-Range Planning than the average.

Figure 7 illustrates the differing priority assignments in this category.

TABLE IX

EDUCATIONAL NEEDS FOR ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES: P
OF SCHOOL BOARDS, EDUCATORS, STUDENTS, CITIZE

ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES	SCHOOL BOARDS (N = 38)			EDUCATORS (N = 208)		
	PER-CENT*	AVER-AGE	RANK	PER-CENT	AVER-AGE	RANK
Curriculum Development	13.16	3.97	1	25.00	3.48	1
Long-range Program Planning	21.05	4.50	3	10.10	4.24	2
Pupil Personnel Services	0.00	6.05	7	11.06	4.68	3
School-Community Relations	26.32	4.50	4	15.87	4.99	4
School Facility Planning	5.26	5.34	5	15.87	5.01	5
Supervision of Instruction	21.05	4.24	2	6.25	5.68	8
Research and Evaluation	5.26	5.45	6	4.33	5.65	7
Staff Personnel Services	2.63	6.11	8	4.81	5.38	6
Business Management	5.26	6.39	9	3.85	7.68	9
Data Processing	0.00	8.45	10	2.88	8.21	10

* This represents the percent of respondents ranking a given item n

TABLE IX

NEEDS FOR ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES: PERCENTS, AVERAGES AND RANKS
BOARDS, EDUCATORS, STUDENTS, CITIZENS, AND THE TOTAL SAMPLE

SCHOOL BOARDS (N = 38)			EDUCATORS (N = 208)			STUDENTS (N = 93)			CITIZENS (N = 112)			TOTAL (N = 451)		
PER-CENT*	AVER-AGE	RANK	PER-CENT	AVER-AGE	RANK	PER-CENT	AVER-AGE	RANK	PER-CENT	AVER-AGE	RANK	PER-CENT	AVER-AGE	RANK
13.16	3.97	1	25.00	3.48	1	16.13	4.69	3	17.86	4.08	1	20.40	3.92	1
21.05	4.50	3	10.10	4.24	2	10.75	5.13	6	12.50	4.67	4	11.75	4.55	2
0.00	6.05	7	11.06	4.68	3	16.13	4.43	1	11.61	5.29	5	11.31	4.89	3
26.32	4.50	4	15.87	4.99	4	16.13	5.10	5	18.75	4.66	3	17.52	4.89	4
5.26	5.34	5	15.87	5.01	5	12.90	4.49	2	7.14	5.35	6	12.20	5.02	5
21.05	4.24	2	6.25	5.68	8	8.60	5.75	7	20.54	4.27	2	11.53	5.22	6
5.26	5.45	6	4.33	5.65	7	8.60	4.88	4	5.36	5.60	7	5.54	5.46	7
2.63	6.11	8	4.81	5.38	6	2.15	6.28	8	0.00	6.25	8	2.88	5.84	8
5.26	6.39	9	3.85	7.68	9	3.23	6.89	9	3.57	6.46	9	3.77	7.11	9
0.00	8.45	10	2.88	8.21	10	5.38	7.35	10	2.68	8.38	10	3.10	8.10	10

of respondents ranking a given item number 1.

TABLE X

EDUCATIONAL NEEDS FOR ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES: PERC
OF URBAN SAMPLES, RURAL SAMPLES, REMOTE RURAL SAMPL

ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES	URBAN (N = 120)			RUR (N =
	PER-CENT*	AVER-AGE	RANK	PER-CENT	AV A
Curriculum Development	19.17	4.03	1	22.13	3.
Long-Range Program Planning	15.83	4.29	2	10.21	4.
Pupil Personnel Services	10.83	4.93	4	8.94	5.
School-Community Relations	20.83	4.29	3	14.89	5.
School Facility Planning	7.50	5.28	5	14.89	4.
Supervision of Instruction	10.00	5.53	7	11.91	5.
Research and Evaluation	4.17	5.50	6	6.81	5.
Staff Personnel Services	4.17	6.01	8	3.40	5.
Business Management	4.17	7.14	9	3.83	7.
Data Processing	3.33	8.01	10	2.98	8.

* This represents the percent of respondents ranking a given ite

TABLE X

FOR ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES: PERCENTS, AVERAGES, AND RANKS
RURAL SAMPLES, REMOTE RURAL SAMPLES, AND THE TOTAL SAMPLE

URBAN (N = 120)			RURAL (N = 235)			REMOTE RURAL (N = 96)			TOTAL (N = 451)		
PER-CENT*	AVER-AGE	RANK	PER-CENT	AVER-AGE	RANK	PER-CENT	AVER-AGE	RANK	PER-CENT	AVER-AGE	RANK
19.17	4.03	1	22.13	3.76	1	17.71	4.18	1	20.40	3.92	1
15.83	4.29	2	10.21	4.59	2	10.42	4.79	4	11.75	4.55	2
10.83	4.93	4	8.94	5.05	4	17.71	4.48	2	11.31	4.89	3
20.83	4.29	3	14.89	5.32	7	19.79	4.58	3	17.52	4.89	4
7.50	5.28	5	14.89	4.80	3	11.46	5.22	6	12.20	5.02	5
10.00	5.53	7	11.91	5.13	5	12.50	5.07	5	11.53	5.22	6
4.17	5.50	6	6.81	5.26	6	4.17	5.92	8	5.54	5.46	7
4.17	6.01	8	3.40	5.91	8	0.00	5.46	7	2.88	5.84	8
4.17	7.14	9	3.83	7.12	9	3.13	7.02	9	3.77	7.11	9
3.33	8.01	10	2.98	8.06	10	3.13	8.28	10	3.10	8.10	10

of respondents ranking a given item number 1.

Administrative Services	School Boards	Educators	Students	Citizens	Ave. Rank	Urban	Rural	Remote Rural	Ave. Rank
Curriculum Development	1	1	3	1	1	1	1	1	1
Long-Range Program Planning	3	2	6	4	2	2	2	4	2
Pupil Personnel Services	7	3	1	5	3	4	4	2	3
School-Community Relations	4	4	5	3	4	3	7	3	4
School Facility Planning	5	5	2	6	5	5	3	6	5
Supervision of Instruction	2	8	7	2	6	7	5	5	6
Research and Evaluation	6	7	4	7	7	6	6	8	7
Staff Personnel Services	8	6	8	8	8	8	8	7	8
Business Management	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9
Data Processing	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10

Figure 7. Ranking of Administrative Services by All Groups and Geographic Areas

Category VI: Pupil Services

The priorities assigned by the total sample for services to pupils placed Elementary School Guidance first; Junior High School Guidance, second; In-School Placement of Pupils, third; Educational-Vocational Placement, fourth; Information on Careers and Occupations, fifth; Psychological Testing and Referral, sixth; Achievement Testing, seventh; Social Work, eighth; School Health, ninth; and Follow-up of Graduates, tenth.

Inspection of data shown in Table XI shows some significant differences among the groups in ranking these areas of services. Only Educators ranked Elementary School Guidance first--Students ranked this sixth. School Boards and Citizens ranked Junior High School Guidance first while Educators and Students rated it lower. Educators gave a much higher priority to the In-School Placement of Pupils than did the other groups, and Students gave Educational-Vocational Placement a higher ranking than the other groups. Educators gave a significantly lower rating to Information on Careers and Occupations than did the other groups--Students ranked this first. Educators gave a priority of third to the sixth-ranked Psychological Testing and Referral, and Educators and Students ranked Achievement Testing much lower than did School Boards and Citizens. School Boards rated Social Work last, and like Students, gave Follow-up of Graduates a higher rating than the overall rank of this service. School

Boards and Students most often deviated more than one rank from the average in this category, but all groups perceived the needs in pupil services differently.

When ranked by geographic areas, it was found that Urban areas were more concerned with Psychological Testing and Referral than the average, and less concerned with Educational-Vocational Placement. Rural areas were least concerned with Achievement Testing, and Remote Rural areas gave Social Work tenth place. Remote Rural areas were also less concerned with In-School Placement of Pupils than the other areas (Table XII).

Figure 8 shows the differing priority assignments in this category.

TABLE XI

EDUCATIONAL NEEDS FOR PUPIL SERVICES: PERCENTS, A
OF SCHOOL BOARDS, EDUCATORS, STUDENTS, CITIZENS, AN

PUPIL SERVICES	SCHOOL BOARDS (N = 38)			EDUCATORS (N = 208)			
	PER-CENT*	AVER-AGE	RANK	PER-CENT	AVER-AGE	RANK	PER CEN
Elementary School Guidance	26.32	3.92	2	28.85	3.92	1	10.
Junior High School Guidance	18.42	3.47	1	5.29	4.65	4	12.
In-School Placement of Pupils	10.53	5.21	5	19.23	4.16	2	7.
Educational-Vocational Placement	7.89	5.00	4	9.13	4.97	5	6.
Information on Careers and Occupations	7.89	4.26	3	8.17	5.87	6	25.8
Psychological Testing and Referral	2.63	5.63	7	10.10	4.63	3	6.4
Achievement Testing	10.53	5.26	6	3.37	7.01	9	5.3
Social Work	0.00	8.34	10	4.81	6.18	7	15.0
School Health	2.63	7.55	9	4.33	6.56	8	4.30
Follow-up of Graduates	13.16	6.34	8	6.73	7.05	10	5.38

* This represents the percent of respondents ranking a given item number 1

TABLE XI

PUPIL SERVICES: PERCENTS, AVERAGES, AND RANKS
CATORS, STUDENTS, CITIZENS, AND THE TOTAL SAMPLE

BOARDS 38)		EDUCATORS (N = 208)			STUDENTS (N = 93)			CITIZENS (N = 112)			TOTAL (N = 451)		
ER-GE	RANK	PER-CENT	AVER-AGE	RANK	PER-CENT	AVER-AGE	RANK	PER-CENT	AVER-AGE	RANK	PER-CENT	AVER-AGE	RANK
92	2	28.85	3.92	1	10.75	5.47	6	19.64	4.25	3	22.62	4.32	1
47	1	5.29	4.65	4	12.90	4.69	3	15.18	3.85	1	10.42	4.36	2
21	5	19.23	4.16	2	7.53	4.96	4	8.93	5.33	5	13.53	4.70	3
00	4	9.13	4.97	5	6.45	4.67	2	10.71	4.64	4	8.87	4.83	4
26	3	8.17	5.87	6	25.81	4.26	1	25.89	3.98	2	16.19	4.93	5
63	7	10.10	4.63	3	6.45	5.16	5	10.71	5.38	6	8.87	5.01	6
26	6	3.37	7.01	9	5.38	6.74	10	3.57	5.88	7	4.43	6.53	7
34	10	4.81	6.18	7	15.05	5.76	7	1.79	7.42	9	5.76	6.58	8
55	9	4.33	6.56	8	4.30	6.74	9	1.79	6.77	8	3.55	6.73	9
34	8	6.73	7.05	10	5.38	6.55	8	1.79	7.49	10	5.76	7.00	10

ents ranking a given item number 1.

TABLE XII

EDUCATIONAL NEEDS FOR PUPIL SERVICES: PERCENTS, AVERAGES, AND RANKS OF URBAN SAMPLES, RURAL SAMPLES, REMOTE RURAL SAMPLES, AND THE TOTAL SAMPLE

PUPIL SERVICES	URBAN (N = 120)			RURAL (N = 235)			REMOTE RURAL (N = 96)			TOTAL (N = 451)		
	PERCENT*	AVERAGE	RANK	PERCENT	AVERAGE	RANK	PERCENT	AVERAGE	RANK	PERCENT	AVERAGE	RANK
lementary School uidance	30.83	3.87	1	19.15	4.62	3	20.83	4.18	2	22.62	4.32	1
unior High School uidance	10.00	4.40	2	11.06	4.54	1	9.38	3.86	1	10.42	4.36	2
n-School Placement of upils	13.33	4.48	3	14.89	4.71	4	10.42	4.95	5	13.53	4.70	3
ducational-Vocational lacement	6.67	5.38	6	10.21	4.61	2	8.33	4.69	3	8.87	4.83	4
nformation on Careers nd Occupations	10.83	5.26	5	17.02	4.84	5	20.83	4.75	4	16.19	4.93	5
sychological Testing nd Referral	10.00	4.61	4	7.23	5.11	6	11.46	5.26	6	8.87	5.01	6
chievement esting	4.17	6.32	8	3.40	6.85	10	7.29	6.00	7	4.43	6.53	7
ocial ork	8.33	6.00	7	6.38	6.54	7	1.04	7.42	10	5.76	6.58	8
chool ealth	2.50	6.95	9	3.83	6.58	8	4.17	6.83	8	3.55	6.73	9
ollow-up of raduates	3.33	7.74	10	6.81	6.59	9	6.25	7.06	9	5.76	7.00	10

* This represents the percent of respondents ranking a given item number 1.

Pupil Services	School Boards	Educators	Students	Citizens	Ave. Rank	Urban	Rural	Remote Rural	Ave. Rank
Elementary School Guidance	2	1	6	3	1	1	3	2	1
Junior High School Guidance	1	4	3	1	2	2	1	1	2
In-School Placement of Pupils	5	2	4	5	3	3	4	5	3
Educational-Vocational Placement	4	5	2	4	4	6	2	3	4
Information on Careers and Occupations	3	6	1	2	5	5	5	4	5
Psychological Testing and Referral	7	3	5	6	6	4	6	6	6
Achievement Testing	6	9	10	7	7	8	10	7	7
Social Work	10	7	7	9	8	7	7	10	8
School Health	9	8	9	8	9	9	8	8	9
Follow-up of Graduates	8	10	8	10	10	10	9	9	10

Figure 8. Ranking of Pupil Services by All Groups and Geographic Areas

Category VII: Budget Allocations

As shown in Table XIII, the first overall priority in the educational budget was given to Teaching Personnel, with only Educators actually ranking this first. Textbooks and Instructional Supplies ranked second, and Classroom Facilities, third. Fourth, fifth and sixth priorities were assigned to Libraries and Instructional Center Facilities, Specialized Personnel (Counselors, Psychologists, Social Workers, etc.), and Audio-Visual Equipment. Supportive Personnel (Clerical, Aides, etc.) ranked seventh; Building Maintenance and Operation, eighth; Administrative and Supervisory Personnel, ninth; and Transportation, tenth.

Since School Boards are responsible for reviewing and approving school budgets, a closer inspection of the priority assignments of this group is in order. School Board members gave the top priority ratings to Textbooks and Instructional Supplies, Teaching Personnel, and Libraries and Instructional Center Facilities. Respondents in this group differed more than one priority rank from the average by assigning Supportive Personnel to ninth position, and are more concerned with Building Maintenance and Operation than the other groups.

Of the geographic areas, only Rural areas gave top priority to Classroom Facilities, and Remote Rural areas were less concerned with Supervisory Personnel than the overall average (Table XIV). In other budget concerns, the geographic areas ranked

the items as did the respondent groups. Figure 9 illustrates the comparison of rankings in this category.

TABLE XIII

EDUCATIONAL NEEDS FOR BUDGET ALLOCATIONS: PERCENT
OF SCHOOL BOARDS, EDUCATORS, STUDENTS, CITIZENS,

BUDGET ALLOCATIONS	SCHOOL BOARDS (N = 38)			EDUCATORS (N = 208)		
	PER-CENT*	AVER-AGE	RANK	PER-CENT	AVER-AGE	RANK
Teaching Personnel	28.95	3.63	2	38.94	3.19	1
Textbooks and Instructional Supplies	13.16	3.61	1	10.58	3.97	3
Classroom Facilities	13.16	4.82	4	19.23	3.75	2
Libraries and Instructional Center Facilities	10.53	4.32	3	5.77	4.63	4
Specialized Personnel(Counselors, Psychologists, Social Workers)	10.53	5.66	6	11.54	5.10	5
Audio-Visual Equipment	2.63	6.24	7	1.44	6.07	7
Supportive Personnel (Clerical, Aides, etc.)	0.00	7.32	9	5.29	5.69	6
Building Maintenance and Operation	15.79	5.08	5	4.33	6.74	8
Administrative and Supervisory Personnel	5.26	6.39	8	1.44	7.22	9
Transportation	0.00	7.95	10	1.44	8.66	10

* This represents the percent of respondents ranking a given item num

E XIII

TIONS: PERCENTS, AVERAGES, AND RANKS
ENTS, CITIZENS, AND THE TOTAL SAMPLE

	EDUCATORS (N = 208)		STUDENTS (N = 93)		CITIZENS (N = 112)		TOTAL (N = 451)	
T	AVERAGE	RANK	PERCENT	AVERAGE	RANK	PERCENT	AVERAGE	RANK
94	3.19	1	22.58	4.31	3	28.57	3.47	2	32.15	3.53	1
58	3.97	3	20.43	3.81	2	18.75	3.37	1	14.86	3.75	2
23	3.75	2	16.13	3.42	1	13.39	4.16	3	16.63	3.88	3
77	4.63	4	8.60	4.38	4	5.36	4.74	4	6.65	4.58	4
54	5.10	5	12.90	5.41	5	15.18	5.28	5	12.64	5.25	5
44	6.07	7	5.38	5.84	6	5.36	5.54	6	3.33	5.90	6
29	5.69	6	1.08	7.17	9	1.79	6.95	9	3.10	6.45	7
83	6.74	8	7.53	6.22	7	3.57	6.91	8	5.76	6.53	8
44	7.22	9	2.15	6.83	8	6.25	6.46	7	3.10	6.88	9
44	8.66	10	3.23	7.62	10	1.79	8.13	10	1.77	8.25	10

given item number 1.

TABLE XIV

EDUCATIONAL NEEDS FOR BUDGET ALLOCATIONS: PERCENTS, AV
URBAN SAMPLES, RURAL SAMPLES, REMOTE RURAL SAMPLES, A

BUDGET ALLOCATIONS	URBAN (N = 120)			RURAL (N = 235	
	PER-CENT*	AVER-AGE	RANK	PER-CENT	AVER-AGE
Teaching Personnel	45.83	2.99	1	26.38	3.74
Textbooks and Instructional Supplies	10.83	3.58	2	14.47	3.86
Classroom Facilities	12.50	4.13	3	20.85	3.62
Libraries and Instructional Center Facilities	6.67	4.40	4	6.81	4.73
Specialized Personnel (Counselors, Psychologists, Social Workers)	11.67	4.98	5	13.62	5.29
Audio-Visual Equipment	0.83	6.13	7	4.26	5.88
Supportive Personnel (Clerical, Aides, etc.)	3.33	6.13	6	3.83	6.33
Building Maintenance and Operation	5.00	6.91	8	4.68	6.60
Administrative and Supervisory Personnel	0.00	7.07	9	3.83	6.87
Transportation	3.33	8.69	10	1.28	8.09

* This represents the percent of respondents ranking a given item

V

PERCENTS, AVERAGES, AND RANKS OF
RAL SAMPLES, AND THE TOTAL SAMPLE

	RURAL (N = 235)			REMOTE RURAL (N = 96)			TOTAL (N = 451)		
K	PER-CENT	AVER-AGE	RANK	PER-CENT	AVER-AGE	RANK	PER-CENT	AVER-AGE	RANK
	26.38	3.74	2	29.17	3.68	1	32.15	3.53	1
	14.47	3.86	3	20.83	3.73	2	14.86	3.75	2
	20.85	3.62	1	11.46	4.18	3	16.63	3.88	3
	6.81	4.73	4	6.25	4.42	4	6.65	4.58	4
	13.62	5.29	5	11.46	5.52	5	12.64	5.25	5
7	4.26	5.88	6	4.17	5.69	6	3.33	5.90	6
6	3.83	6.33	7	1.04	7.11	9	3.10	6.45	7
8	4.68	6.60	8	9.38	5.90	7	5.76	6.53	8
9	3.83	6.87	9	5.21	6.66	8	3.10	6.88	9
0	1.28	8.09	10	1.04	8.13	10	1.77	8.25	10

g a given item number 1.

Budget Allocations	School Boards	Educators	Students	Citizens	Ave. Rank	Urban	Rural	Remote Rural	Ave. Rank
Teaching Personnel	2	1	3	2	1	1	2	1	1
Textbooks and Instructional Supplies	1	3	2	1	2	2	3	2	2
Classroom Facilities	4	2	1	3	3	3	1	3	3
Libraries and Instructional Center Facilities	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Specialized Personnel	6	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Audio-Visual Equipment	7	7	6	6	6	7	6	6	6
Supportive Personnel	9	6	9	9	7	6	7	9	7
Building Maintenance and Operation	5	8	7	8	8	8	8	7	8
Administrative and Supervisory Personnel	8	9	8	7	9	9	9	8	9
Transportation	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10

Figure 9. Ranking of Budget Allocations by All Groups and Geographic Areas

Category VIII: Instructional Approaches

In this category, opinions were sought regarding the need for ten different instructional approaches to education.

All groups rated Individually Guided Instruction as the first priority in this category and Computer Assisted Instruction as the Instructional Approach of least concern. While Instructional Aides and Resource Persons were rated second by the combined groups, Students and Citizens rated this fourth. The average ratings placed Inquiry Approach (Discovery Method of Instruction) third; School Boards did not give it this importance. Group ratings were close in assigning an average rating of fourth to Staffing Patterns (Team Teaching, etc.), and the overall rating for Flexible Scheduling was fifth. (Students thought this was more important and rated scheduling third.) School Boards and Citizens agreed in assigning a lower rank of eighth to Non-Graded Program, which had an average rank of sixth.

T.V. was given an average ranking of seventh--School Boards and Citizens ranked this a place or two higher. Groups were not too different in their overall placement of Television Assisted Instruction as eighth and ninth-placed Homebound Instruction. (See Table XV.)

An illustration of these rankings is shown as Figure 10.

It is seen that by geographic areas, Urban areas rated Instructional Aids and Resources lower than average and Computer Assisted Instruction higher. The Remote Rural

Rural areas showed greater concern for the need for Audio-Visual Instruction than the other areas (Table XVI).

An illustration of these rankings is shown as Figure 10.

TABLE XV

EDUCATIONAL NEEDS FOR INSTRUCTIONAL APPROACHES
AND RANKS OF SCHOOL BOARDS, EDUCATORS, STUDENTS, CIT

INSTRUCTIONAL APPROACHES	SCHOOL BOARDS (N = 38)			EDUCATORS (N = 208)		
	PERCENT*	AVERAGE	RANK	PERCENT	AVERAGE	RANK
Individually Guided Instruction	52.63	2.66	1	31.73	2.92	1
Instructional Aides and Resource Persons	5.26	4.53	2	11.54	4.17	2
Inquiry Approach (Discovery Method of Instruction)	7.89	5.29	5	10.58	4.28	3
Staffing Patterns (Team Teaching, etc.)	5.26	4.61	3	9.62	4.81	5
Flexible Scheduling	5.26	4.82	4	12.02	4.85	6
Non-Graded Program	13.16	6.50	8	19.71	4.42	4
Audio-Visual Instruction Other Than Educational TV	2.63	5.34	6	0.96	6.31	7
Television Assisted Instruction	5.26	6.37	7	1.44	7.33	8
Homebound Instruction	2.63	7.18	9	0.48	7.94	9
Computer Assisted Instruction	0.00	7.71	10	1.92	7.95	10

* This represents the percent of respondents ranking a given item nu

LE XV

NAL APPROACHES: PERCENTS, AVERAGES,
STUDENTS, CITIZENS, AND THE TOTAL SAMPLE

EDUCATORS (N = 208)			STUDENTS (N = 93)			CITIZENS (N = 112)			TOTAL (N = 451)		
T	AVER-AGE	RANK	PER-CENT	AVER-AGE	RANK	PER-CENT	AVER-AGE	RANK	PER-CENT	AVER-AGE	RANK
73	2.92	1	31.18	3.43	1	39.29	3.14	1	35.25	3.06	1
54	4.17	2	8.60	4.80	4	3.57	4.64	4	8.43	4.45	2
58	4.28	3	8.60	4.63	2	8.93	4.41	2	9.53	4.47	3
62	4.81	5	10.75	5.12	5	9.82	4.63	3	9.53	4.81	4
02	4.85	6	12.90	4.71	3	5.36	5.69	6	9.98	5.03	5
71	4.42	4	17.20	5.54	6	9.82	6.72	8	16.19	5.40	6
96	6.31	7	3.23	6.03	7	15.18	5.12	5	5.10	5.88	7
44	7.33	8	0.00	7.04	9	3.57	6.33	7	2.00	6.94	8
48	7.94	9	4.30	6.65	8	3.57	6.88	9	2.22	7.35	9
92	7.95	10	3.23	7.05	10	0.89	7.45	10	1.77	7.62	10

a given item number 1.

EDUCATIONAL NEEDS FOR INSTRU
OF URBAN SAMPLES, RURAL SA

INSTRUCTIONAL APPROACHES	PER CEN
Individually Guided Instruction	34.
Instructional Aides and Resource Persons	5.8
Inquiry Approach (Discovery Method of Instruction)	10.8
Staffing Patterns (Team Teaching, etc.)	12.5
Flexible Scheduling	13.33
Non-Graded Program	17.50
Audio-Visual Instruction Other Than Educational TV	3.33
Television Assisted Instruction	0.83
Homebound Instruction	0.00
Computer Assisted Instruction	1.67

* This represents the percent of respondent

TABLE XVI

INSTRUCTIONAL APPROACHES: PERCENTS, AVERAGES, AND RANKS
URAL SAMPLES, REMOTE RURAL SAMPLES, AND THE TOTAL SAMPLE

URBAN (N = 120)			RURAL (N = 235)			REMOTE RURAL (N = 96)			TOTAL (N = 451)		
PER-CENT*	AVER-AGE	RANK	PER-CENT	AVER-AGE	RANK	PER-CENT	AVER-AGE	RANK	PER-CENT	AVER-AGE	RANK
34.17	2.93	1	34.89	3.13	1	37.50	3.05	1	35.25	3.06	1
5.83	4.63	4	7.66	4.36	2	13.54	4.45	2	8.43	4.45	2
10.83	4.08	2	9.79	4.68	3	7.29	4.47	3	9.53	4.47	3
12.50	4.54	3	9.79	5.05	5	5.21	4.55	4	9.53	4.81	4
13.33	5.05	6	8.09	4.83	4	10.42	5.47	6	9.98	5.03	5
17.50	4.99	5	17.45	5.20	6	11.46	6.39	7	16.19	5.40	6
3.33	6.41	7	5.11	5.83	7	7.29	5.31	5	5.10	5.88	7
0.83	7.46	9	2.55	6.77	8	2.08	6.72	8	2.00	6.94	8
0.00	7.72	10	3.40	7.27	9	2.08	7.06	9	2.22	7.35	9
1.67	7.20	8	1.28	7.87	10	3.13	7.53	10	1.77	7.62	10

of respondents ranking a given item number 1.

Instructional Approaches	School Boards	Educators	Students	Citizens	Ave. Rank	Urban	Rural	Remote Rural	Ave. Rank
Individually Guided Instruction	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Instructional Aides and Resource Persons	2	2	4	4	2	4	2	2	2
Inquiry Approach	5	3	2	2	3	2	3	3	3
Staffing Patterns	3	5	5	3	4	3	5	4	4
Flexible Scheduling	4	6	3	6	5	6	4	6	5
Non-Graded Program	8	4	6	8	6	5	6	7	6
Audio-Visual Instruction Other Than Educational TV	6	7	7	5	7	7	7	5	7
Television Assisted Instruction	7	8	9	7	8	9	8	8	8
Homebound Instruction	9	9	8	9	9	10	9	9	9
Computer Assisted Instruction	10	10	10	10	10	8	10	10	10

Figure 10. Ranking of Instructional Approaches by All Groups and Geographic Areas

Category IX: Educational Programs

In this category respondents were asked to rank the need for additional emphasis hat should be given various types of educational programs. As shown in Table XVII, tudents most often differed from the average ranking. Of the ten types of programs anked, Students perceived six areas differently than the average for the combined roups. However, all groups gave first priority to Program for Slow Learners and were n close agreement in assigning Program for Alienated Youth (Potential Dropouts, Unotivated, etc.) in second place. The average ranking for Program for Academically alented was third with Students and Citizens rating this lower. The average rating or the fourth rank was Program for Educationally Disadvantaged--School Boards rated his type of program sixth. Fifth-ranked was Program for Average Pupils: School oards ranked this second, and Students ranked it ninth. While Students rated Program or High School Terminal Students eighth, this received an overall rank of sixth, and rogram for Emotionally Disturbed had an average ranking of seventh. Eighth-ranked rogram for Mentally Handicapped (Trainable, Educable, etc.) was placed third by Stuents, and ninth-ranked Program for Physically Handicapped (Visual, Orthopedic, etc.) as rated higher by Students and Citizens. Program for Culturally Distinct was rated enth.

When this category is viewed by geographic areas, only Urban areas deviated more han one rank from the average of the respondent groups by assigning Mentally

Handicapped to last place (Table XVIII). Figure 11 is an illustration of the differing priority assignments in this category.

TABLE XVII

EDUCATIONAL NEEDS FOR EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS: PERC
OF SCHOOL BOARDS, EDUCATORS, STUDENTS, CITIZENS

EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS	SCHOOL BOARDS (N = 38)			EDUCATORS (N = 208)		
	PER-CENT*	AVER-AGE	RANK	PER-CENT	AVER-AGE	RANK
Program for Slow Learners	18.42	3.18	1	16.35	3.90	1
Program for Alienated Youth (Potential Dropouts, Unmotivated, etc.)	15.79	4.74	3	14.90	4.63	3
Program for Academically Talented	13.16	5.13	4	16.35	4.27	2
Program for Educationally Disadvantaged	5.26	5.58	6	8.65	5.25	4
Program for Average Pupils	28.95	4.50	2	17.31	5.28	5
Program for High School Terminal Students	10.53	5.42	5	12.02	5.38	6
Program for Emotionally Disturbed	0.00	6.29	8	4.33	5.89	7
Program for Mentally Handicapped (Trainable, Educable, etc.)	5.26	6.26	7	4.33	6.61	8
Program for Physically Handicapped (Visual, Orthopedic, etc.)	2.63	6.39	9	1.44	6.98	10
Program for Culturally Distinct	0.00	7.50	10	4.33	6.81	9

* This represents the percent of respondents ranking a given item numbe

PERCENTS, AVERAGES, AND RANKS
IZENS, AND THE TOTAL SAMPLE

RS)	STUDENTS (N = 93)			CITIZENS (N = 112)			TOTAL (N = 451)		
RANK	PER-CENT	AVER-AGE	RANK	PER-CENT	AVER-AGE	RANK	PER-CENT	AVER-AGE	RANK
1	17.20	3.47	1	18.75	3.92	1	17.29	3.76	1
3	20.43	4.26	2	13.39	4.82	2	15.74	4.61	2
2	13.98	5.99	7	18.75	5.26	6	16.19	4.94	3
4	8.60	5.23	4	6.25	5.16	3	7.76	5.25	4
5	12.90	6.40	9	19.64	5.24	4	17.96	5.43	5
6	3.23	6.30	8	8.93	5.26	5	9.31	5.54	6
7	4.30	5.34	5	3.57	5.92	8	3.77	5.82	7
8	9.68	5.06	3	6.25	5.99	9	5.99	6.11	8
10	7.53	5.38	6	2.68	5.80	7	3.10	6.31	9
9	2.15	7.57	10	1.79	7.63	10	2.88	7.23	10

tem number 1.

T

EDUCATIONAL NEEDS FOR EDUCATIONAL P
URBAN SAMPLES, RURAL SAMPLES, RE

EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS	URBA (N = 1 PER-CENT*	AVE AG
Program for Slow Learners	10.00	4.4
Program for Alienated Youth (Potential Dropouts, Unmotivated, etc.)	15.00	4.6
Program for Academically Talented	14.17	4.8
Program for Educationally Disadvantaged	12.50	4.9
Program for Average Pupils	27.50	5.12
Program for High School Terminal Students	8.33	5.83
Program for Emotionally Disturbed	1.67	5.80
Program for Mentally Handicapped (Trainable, Educable, etc.)	4.17	6.60
Program for Physically Handicapped (Visual, Orthopedic, etc.)	4.17	6.11
Program for Culturally Distinct	2.50	6.59

* This represents the percent of respondents rank

LE XVIII

OGRAMS: PERCENTS, AVERAGES, AND RANKS OF
TE RURAL SAMPLES, AND THE TOTAL SAMPLE

	RURAL (N = 235)			REMOTE RURAL (N = 96)			TOTAL (N = 451)		
RANK	PER-CENT	AVER-AGE	RANK	PER-CENT	AVER-AGE	RANK	PER-CENT	AVER-AGE	RANK
1	17.87	3.58	1	25.00	3.26	1	17.29	3.76	1
2	15.74	4.58	2	16.67	4.64	2	15.74	4.61	2
3	17.45	5.12	3	15.63	4.66	3	16.19	4.94	3
4	6.38	5.37	4	5.21	5.29	5	7.76	5.25	4
5	13.62	5.76	6	16.67	5.03	4	17.96	5.43	5
7	8.94	5.38	5	11.46	5.58	6	9.31	5.54	6
6	5.53	3.83	7	2.08	5.80	7	3.77	5.82	7
10	6.81	5.85	8	6.25	6.14	8	5.99	6.11	8
8	3.40	6.22	9	1.04	6.77	9	3.10	6.31	9
9	4.26	7.31	10	0.00	7.83	10	2.88	7.23	10

nking a given item number 1.

Educational Programs	School Boards	Educa-tors	Stu-dents	Citi-zens	Ave. Rank	Urban	Rural	Remote Rural	Ave. Rank
Program for Slow Learners	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Program for Alienated Youth	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Program for Academically Talented	4	2	7	6	3	3	3	3	3
Program for Educationally Disadvantaged	6	4	4	3	4	4	4	5	4
Program for Average Pupils	2	5	9	4	5	5	6	4	5
Program for High School Terminal Students	5	6	8	5	6	7	5	6	6
Program for Emotionally Disturbed	8	7	5	8	7	6	7	7	7
Program for Mentally Handicapped	7	8	3	9	8	10	8	8	8
Program for Physically Handicapped	9	10	6	7	9	8	9	9	9
Program for Culturally Distinct	10	9	10	10	10	9	10	10	10

Figure 11. Ranking of Educational Programs by All Groups and Geographic Areas

Category X: In-Service Education

In-service education includes those types of activities and programs directed toward improving and updating professional personnel. As shown in Table XIX, rankings of the groups were quite similar in designating Education in Motivating and Guiding Pupils first priority; Education in Diagnosing Pupil Needs, second; Education in Planning Instruction and Developing Curriculum, third; and Education in Student Program Evaluation, fourth. The average of all groups ranked Education in Group Dynamics and Human Relations fifth, however, School Boards and Students ranked this lower. School Boards ranked Education in Classroom Management fourth, but the total group rankings placed this area sixth. Groups were quite close in ranking Education in Selecting and Utilizing Materials and Equipment seventh, but the overall eighth-place ranking to Education in Subject Matter Content showed differences among the groups; Educators gave this a higher priority. The groups were nearly consistent in ranking Education in Varied Staffing Patterns (Team Teaching, etc.) ninth, and Education in Reporting Pupil Progress tenth.

Inspection of Figure 12, shows that for Urban areas Group Dynamics was of greater concern and Education in Classroom Management of less concern than the average rankings for geographic areas. Group Dynamics was of lesser concern to the Remote Rural areas. (See Table XX).

TABLE XIX

EDUCATIONAL NEEDS FOR IN-SERVICE EDUCATION: PERCEN
OF SCHOOL BOARDS, EDUCATORS, STUDENTS, CITIZENS,

IN-SERVICE EDUCATION	SCHOOL BOARDS (N = 38)			EDUCATORS (N = 208)			P
	PER-CENT*	AVER-AGE	RANK	PER-CENT	AVER-AGE	RANK	C
Education in Motivating and Guiding Pupils	44.74	2.53	1	30.29	2.87	1	2
Education in Diagnosing Pupil Needs	21.05	3.34	2	21.15	3.16	2	1
Education in Planning Instruction and Developing Curriculum	2.63	4.95	3	8.17	4.79	3	1
Education in Student and Program Evaluation	2.63	5.37	5	3.37	5.39	4	
Education in Group Dynamics and Human Relations	2.63	7.00	8	9.62	5.75	5	1
Education in Classroom Management	5.26	5.00	4	5.29	6.50	7	
Education in Selecting and Utilizing Materials and Equipment	2.63	6.11	7	3.37	5.98	6	
Education in Subject Matter Content	7.89	5.79	6	8.17	6.99	9	1
Education in Varied Staffing Patterns (Team Teaching, etc.)	2.63	7.76	10	8.17	6.53	8	
Education in Reporting Pupil Progress	7.89	7.16	9	2.40	7.04	10	

* This represents the percent of respondents ranking a given item numb

TABLE XIX

CE EDUCATION: PERCENTS, AVERAGES, AND RANKS
STUDENTS, CITIZENS, AND THE TOTAL SAMPLE

EDUCATORS (N = 208)			STUDENTS (N = 93)			CITIZENS (N = 112)			TOTAL (N = 451)		
PER-CENT	AVER-AGE	RANK	PER-CENT	AVER-AGE	RANK	PER-CENT	AVER-AGE	RANK	PER-CENT	AVER-AGE	RANK
30.29	2.87	1	27.96	3.44	1	41.07	2.71	1	33.70	2.92	1
21.15	3.16	2	16.13	3.95	2	20.54	3.09	2	19.96	3.32	2
8.17	4.79	3	12.90	4.95	3	6.25	5.35	4	8.20	4.98	3
3.37	5.39	4	5.38	5.26	4	3.57	5.18	3	3.77	5.31	4
9.62	5.75	5	10.75	5.71	7	7.14	5.98	5	8.65	5.90	5
5.29	6.50	7	8.60	5.71	6	7.14	6.21	7	6.43	6.14	6
3.37	5.98	6	2.15	6.52	8	1.79	6.30	8	2.66	6.18	7
8.17	6.99	9	11.83	5.38	5	7.14	6.13	6	8.65	6.34	8
8.17	6.53	8	2.15	6.74	9	1.79	7.33	10	4.88	6.88	9
2.40	7.04	10	2.15	7.35	10	3.57	6.73	9	3.10	7.04	10

king a given item number 1.

TABLE XX

EDUCATIONAL NEEDS FOR IN-SERVICE EDUCATION: PERCENTS, A
OF URBAN SAMPLES, RURAL SAMPLES, REMOTE RURAL SAMPLES, A

IN-SERVICE EDUCATION	URBAN (N = 120)			RURAL (N - 235)		
	PER-CENT*	AVER-AGE	RANK	PER-CENT	AVER-AGE	RA
Education in Motivating and Guiding Pupils	34.17	2.75	1	30.64	3.06	
Education in Diagnosing Pupil Needs	20.00	3.21	2	21.70	3.28	
Education in Planning Instruction and Developing Curriculum	6.67	5.19	4	9.79	4.94	
Education in Student and Program Evaluation	4.17	5.83	5	3.83	5.09	
Education in Group Dynamics and Human Relations	12.50	5.10	3	6.81	6.04	
Education in Classroom Management	2.50	6.52	8	7.66	6.12	
Education in Selecting and Utilizing Materials and Equipment	1.67	6.15	6	2.98	6.20	
Education in Subject Matter Content	9.17	6.33	7	8.51	6.36	
Education in Varied Staffing Patterns (Team Teaching, etc.)	5.00	6.63	9	5.53	6.89	
Education in Reporting Pupil Progress	4.17	7.29	10	2.55	7.04	1

* This represents the percent of respondents ranking a given item numb

92

TABLE XX

CE EDUCATION: PERCENTS, AVERAGES, AND RANKS
, REMOTE RURAL SAMPLES, AND THE TOTAL SAMPLE

URBAN (N = 120)		RURAL (N - 235)			REMOTE RURAL (N = 96)			TOTAL (N = 451)		
AVER-AGE	RANK	PER-CENT	AVER-AGE	RANK	PER-CENT	AVER-AGE	RANK	PER-CENT	AVER-AGE	RANK
2.75	1	30.64	3.06	1	40.63	2.78	1	33.70	2.92	1
3.21	2	21.70	3.28	2	15.63	3.56	2	19.96	3.32	2
5.19	4	9.79	4.94	3	6.25	4.79	3	8.20	4.98	3
5.83	5	3.83	5.09	4	3.13	5.21	4	3.77	5.31	4
5.10	3	6.81	6.04	5	8.33	6.56	8	8.65	5.90	5
6.52	8	7.66	6.12	6	8.33	5.72	5	6.43	6.14	6
6.15	6	2.98	6.20	7	3.13	6.19	6	2.66	6.18	7
6.33	7	8.51	6.36	8	8.33	6.31	7	8.65	6.34	8
6.63	9	5.53	6.89	9	3.13	7.16	10	4.88	6.88	9
7.29	10	2.55	7.04	10	3.13	6.72	9	3.10	7.04	10

ts ranking a given item number 1.

In-Service Education	School Boards	Educators	Students	Citizens	Ave. Rank	Urban	Rural	Remote Rural	Ave. Rank
Education in Motivating and Guiding Pupils	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Education in Diagnosing Pupil Needs	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Education in Planning Instruction & Developing Curriculum	3	3	3	4	3	4	3	3	3
Education in Student and Program Evaluation	5	4	4	3	4	5	4	4	4
Education in Group Dynamics and Human Relations	8	5	7	5	5	3	5	8	5
Education in Classroom Management	4	7	6	7	6	8	6	5	6
Education in Selecting & Utilizing Materials & Equipment	7	6	8	8	7	6	7	6	7
Education in Subject Matter Content	6	9	5	6	8	7	8	7	8
Education in Varied Staffing Patterns (Team Teaching, etc.)	10	8	9	10	9	9	9	10	9
Education in Reporting Pupil Progress	9	10	10	9	10	10	10	9	10

Figure 12. Ranking of In-Service Education by All Groups and Geographic Areas

Summary

In this chapter specific educational needs have been identified. Rankings by respondent groups have been given as well as the rankings of these groups when arranged by geographic areas. A composite picture of Educational Needs in the State of Nevada is reported in the next chapter.

CHAPTER III

COMPOSITE EDUCATIONAL NEEDS

A picture of respondents' overall perceptions of imperative educational needs was obtained by having each respondent rank, from one to ten, each of the ten items to which he had given first priority in each of the ten categories of need discussed in Chapter II.

Data pertaining to the 15 imperative educational needs which were given the highest overall rankings by the total number of respondents are reported in Table XXI. In this table the number of respondents who ranked each of the needs first, second, third, and fourth, together with the weighted totals and final ranks, are given. To obtain the weighted final ranks, first choices were multiplied by four, second choices by three, third choices by two, and fourth choices by one.

Reading was the preponderant choice of the respondents as the outstanding imperative educational need: The weighted total for this need was almost three times that for the second ranked need. Education in Motivating and Guiding pupils and Teaching Personnel were ranked as second and third imperative educational needs. These areas received fairly similar weighted totals and were given the same number of first choices.

Education in Diagnosing Pupil Needs and Individually Guided Instruction ranked fourth and fifth with less difference between weighted totals than between the third- and fourth-placed imperative needs.

TABLE XXI

COMPOSITE RANKING OF PERCEIVED EDUCATIONAL NEEDS IN ALL CATEGORIES BY THE TOTAL SAMPLE

EDUCATIONAL NEED	NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS RANKING THE NEED: FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH	WEIGHTED TOTALS	RANKS
Reading (Skills, Comprehension, etc.)	64	52	40	23	515	1
Education in Motivating and Guiding Pupils	19	16	21	23	189	2
Teaching Personnel	19	18	14	21	179	3
Education in Diagnosing Pupil Needs	17	11	17	8	143	4
Individually Guided Instruction	10	8	18	26	126	5
Primary Education (Grades 1-3)	5	22	12	11	121	6
Quality of Teacher Candidates	16	11	4	12	117	7
School-Community Relations	11	13	8	9	108	8
Classroom Facilities	14	8	8	9	105	9
Curriculum Development	11	8	14	9	105	10
Program for Slow Learners	10	12	8	12	104	11
Elementary School Guidance	7	13	9	13	98	12
Ineffective Teachers	13	9	5	9	98	13
Non-Graded Program	11	6	11	9	93	14
Early Childhood (3-4 Year Olds)	9	10	6	8	86	15

Therefore, according to the perceptions of the respondents in this survey, the ive most imperative needs in education in the State of Nevada are: Reading, Educa- ion in Motivating and Guiding Pupils, Teaching Personnel, Education in Diagnosing upil Needs, and Individually Guided Instruction.

Little differences are found in the weighted totals of the next five ranked mperative needs. These are: Primary Education, Quality of Teacher Candidates, chool-Community Relations, Classroom Facilities, and Curriculum Development. The eighted totals for the last five ranked needs again showed little, if any, differ- nces. These are: Program for Slow Learners, Elementary School Guidance, Ineffective eachers, Non-Graded Program, and Early Childhood Education.

A composite ranking of perceived educational needs in all categories by espondent groups affords a closer inspection of the overall ranking as shown in able XXI.

School Board

As shown in Table XXII, School Board Members ranked Reading as the most mperative educational need. The weighted total for this priority is over twice s much as the second ranked need, Education in Motivating and Guiding Pupils. eaching Personnel ranked third, and sharply deviating from the total sample, these espondents rated Education in Diagnosing Pupil Needs last. School Board Members

TABLE XXII

COMPOSITE RANKING OF PERCEIVED EDUCATIONAL NEEDS
IN ALL CATEGORIES BY THE SCHOOL BOARD SAMPLE

EDUCATIONAL NEED	NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS RANKING THE NEED: FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH	WEIGHTED TOTALS	RANKS
Reading (Skills, Comprehension etc.)	12	3	4	3	68	1
Education in Motivating and Guiding Pupils	3	1	6	2	29	2
Teaching Personnel	3	1	2	1	20	3
Evaluation of Teachers	3	2	0	0	18	4
Individually Guided Instruction	0	2	3	3	15	5
Quality of Teacher Candidates	3	0	0	2	14	6
Primary Education (Grades 1-3)	0	4	1	0	14	7
School-Community Relations	0	3	0	2	11	8
Ineffective Teachers	0	2	2	1	11	9
Early Childhood (3-4 Year Olds)	1	1	1	2	11	10
Classroom Facilities	1	1	1	1	10	11
Program for Average Pupils	1	1	1	0	9	12
Junior High School Education (Grades 7-9)	2	0	0	1	9	13
Building Maintenance and Operation	0	1	2	1	8	14
Education in Diagnosing Pupil Needs	0	1	1	2	7	15

anked Evaluation of Teachers fourth. Their ranking of the next four needs did not eviate more than one rank from the total sample as they placed Quality of Teacher andidates sixth, Primary Education seventh, and School-Community Relations eighth.

This sample differed from the composite of the total sample by ranking neffective Teachers, Early Childhood Education, and Classroom Facilities next in rder, and were the only group to add Evaluation of Teachers, Program for Average upils, Junior High School Education, and Building Maintenance and Operation to the ist ranked by the total sample. School Board Members did not include Curriculum evelopment, Program for Slow Learners, Elementary Guidance, and Non-Graded Program.

Except in giving first priority to Reading, the weighted totals for the other anks do not differ greatly.

Educators

The composite ranking of the sample of Educators is reported in Table XXIII. eading was given first priority almost three times greater than the next area of oncern, Teaching Personnel. Curriculum Development was ranked third, Primary Educa- ion was fourth, and Education in Diagnosing Pupil Needs was fifth. Curriculum evelopment and Primary Education were not ranked in the top five needs of the omposite of the total sample.

Education in Motivating and Guiding Pupils ranked sixth with Educators; Non- raded Program, seventh; and Individually Guided Instruction, eighth. This was the

TABLE XXIII

COMPOSITE RANKING OF PERCEIVED EDUCATIONAL NEEDS
IN ALL CATEGORIES BY THE SAMPLE OF EDUCATORS

EDUCATIONAL NEED	NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS RANKING THE NEED: FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH	WEIGHTED TOTALS	RANKS
Reading (Skills, Comprehension, etc.)	38	28	26	10	298	1
Teaching Personnel	9	12	9	12	102	2
Curriculum Development	10	4	10	5	77	3
Primary Education (Grades 1-3)	3	12	9	9	75	4
Education in Diagnosing Pupil Needs	9	5	9	4	73	5
Education in Motivating and Guiding Pupils	6	7	7	10	69	6
Non-Graded Program	7	6	5	6	62	7
Individually Guided Instruction	6	4	7	10	60	8
Teacher Involvement in Decision Making	9	2	5	6	58	9
Elementary School Guidance	4	8	5	7	57	10
Classroom Facilities	7	4	4	4	52	11
School-Community Relations	7	5	3	3	52	12
Early Childhood (3-4 Year Olds)	6	5	3	4	49	13
Quality of Teacher Candidates	6	6	1	4	48	14
Program for Slow Learners	4	6	3	7	47	15

only sample group to mention Teacher Involvement in Decision Making, and they did not include Ineffective Teachers.

Students

As illustrated in Table XXIV, the weighted totals for the responses of the sample of Students do not differ greatly from one rank to the other. Students gave top priority to Reading, University Education, Program For Slow Learners, Education in Motivating and Guiding Pupils, and Education in Diagnosing Pupil Needs.

They gave a low rank to Teaching Personnel which was ranked third by the composite of the total sample.

As listed on the composite ranking of the total sample, Students did not include Individually Guided Instruction, Primary Education, School-Community Relations, Curriculum Development, Elementary School Guidance, Ineffective Teachers, Non-Graded Program, and Early Childhood. It is not too surprising that these graduating seniors did not look backward in their school career in the assignment of imperative needs. It is interesting that they added the following to the composite of the total sample ranking of needs: University Education, Program for Alienated Youth, Information on Careers and Occupations, Technical Education, Foreign Languages, Junior High School Guidance, Social Work, and Teacher Salaries.

TABLE XXIV

COMPOSITE RANKING OF PERCEIVED EDUCATIONAL NEEDS IN ALL CATEGORIES BY THE SAMPLE OF STUDENTS

EDUCATIONAL NEED	NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS RANKING THE NEED: FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH	WEIGHTED TOTALS	RANKS
Reading (Skills, Comprehension, etc.)	6	5	2	2	45	1
University Education	6	2	4	2	40	2
Program for Slow Learners	5	3	2	0	33	3
Education in Motivating and Guiding Pupils	4	1	4	3	30	4
Education in Diagnosing Pupil Needs	4	1	3	2	27	5
Program for Alienated Youth (Potential Dropouts, Unmotivated, etc.)	3	2	1	4	24	6
Classroom Facilities	3	2	2	2	24	7
Information on Careers and Occupations	1	2	4	3	21	8
Quality of Teacher Candidates	3	2	0	1	19	9
Technical Education (Electronics, Radio, T.V., etc.)	3	0	2	3	19	10
Foreign Languages	2	2	1	3	19	11
Teaching Personnel	3	0	0	6	18	12
Junior High School Guidance	3	0	3	0	18	13
Social Work	2	2	1	2	18	14
Teacher Salaries	1	4	1	0	18	15

Citizens

As shown on Table XXV, Citizens ranked Reading as the most imperative need in education and Education in Motivating and Guiding Pupils in second position. Their third and fourth priorities followed the total sample in assigning Teaching Personnel and Education in Diagnosing Pupil Needs to these ranks.

From the third rank on, the weighted totals do not differ greatly; however, the assignment of imperative needs differs greatly from the total sample from the fourth rank down. Citizens ranked Quality of Teacher Candidates fifth and Ineffective Teachers sixth. While not listed in the composite ranking of the total sample, they listed Community College Education seventh, followed by Individually Guided Instruction and School-Community Relations.

This sample of Citizens did not include Primary Education, Classroom Facilities, Curriculum Development, Program for Slow Learners, Elementary Guidance, Non-Graded Program, or Early Childhood in their composite list. They did add Community College Education, Trade and Industrial Education, English, University Education, and Long-Range Program Planning. This was the only group to include Teacher Turnover and Program for Academically Talented in their composite ranking.

Urban

In designating a priority of educational needs, the Urban sample most resembles

TABLE XXV

COMPOSITE RANKING OF PERCEIVED EDUCATIONAL NEEDS IN ALL CATEGORIES BY THE SAMPLE OF CITIZENS

EDUCATIONAL NEED	NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS RANKING THE NEED: FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH	WEIGHTED TOTALS	RANKS
Reading (Skills, Comprehension, etc.)	8	16	8	8	104	1
Education in Motivating and Guiding Pupils	6	7	4	8	61	2
Teaching Personnel	4	5	3	2	39	3
Education in Diagnosing Pupil Needs	4	4	4	0	36	4
Quality of Teacher Candidates	4	3	3	5	36	5
Ineffective Teachers	7	1	1	2	35	6
Community College Education	6	2	2	1	35	7
Individually Guided Instruction	4	0	5	8	34	8
School-Community Relations	3	4	4	2	34	9
Trade and Industrial Education (Building Trades, Automotive, etc.)	3	4	3	4	34	10
English (Language Arts)	7	1	0	2	33	11
Teacher Turnover	5	2	1	0	28	12
University Education	5	2	1	0	28	13
Program for Academically Talented	2	3	2	2	23	14
Long-Range Program Planning	4	1	1	1	22	15

the composite of the total sample in ranking the first eight items. Reading again is the overwhelming first choice and Teaching Personnel a strong second choice. The weighted totals do not differ too greatly in ranking the other needs. The Urban sample does not include Classroom Facilities, Curriculum Development, Program for Slow Learners or Non-Graded Program in their composite ranking of needs, but, as shown on Table XXVI, does add Long-Range Planning, University Education, Program for Alienated Youth, and Teachers Salaries. Students were the only other group sample to include Program for Alienated Youth and Teachers Salaries.

Rural

Only in the designation of Reading as the first imperative need was there a sharp delineation in the composite ranking order of the Rural sample. As shown in Table XXVII, this sample omitted Early Childhood, which was included in the composite of the total sample and added, in last position, Trade and Industrial Education.

Except for the first two ranks, Reading and Education in Motivating and Guiding Pupils, the Rural sample assigned priorities quite differently than the composite of the total sample. Education in Diagnosing Pupil Needs, Classroom Facilities, and Non-Graded Program were included in the top five perceived needs, and Quality of Teacher Candidates, Primary Education, School-Community Relations, Elementary School Guidance, and Trade and Industrial Education were ranked last.

TABLE XXVI

COMPOSITE RANKING OF PERCEIVED EDUCATIONAL NEEDS
IN ALL CATEGORIES BY THE URBAN SAMPLE

EDUCATIONAL NEED	NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS RANKING THE NEED: FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH	WEIGHTED TOTALS	RANKS
Reading (Skills, Comprehension, etc.)	18	11	11	11	138	1
Teaching Personnel	8	8	7	10	80	2
Education in Motivating and Guiding Pupils	6	5	4	7	54	3
Individually Guided Instruction	6	3	5	4	47	4
Education in Diagnosing Pupil Needs	5	5	5	1	46	5
Primary Education (Grades 1-3)	2	6	5	4	40	6
School-Community Relations	3	5	4	2	37	7
Quality of Teacher Candidates	3	6	1	4	36	8
University Education	6	3	0	1	34	9
Elementary School Guidance	3	3	3	6	33	10
Ineffective Teachers	3	4	2	2	30	11
Long-Range Program Planning	6	1	0	2	29	12
Early Childhood (3-4 Year Olds)	2	4	3	2	28	13
Teacher Salaries	3	3	2	2	27	14
Program for Alienated Youth (Potential Dropouts, Unmotivated, etc.)	2	3	3	2	25	15

TABLE XXVII

COMPOSITE RANKING OF PERCEIVED EDUCATIONAL NEEDS
IN ALL CATEGORIES BY THE RURAL SAMPLE

EDUCATIONAL NEED	NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS RANKING THE NEED: FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH	WEIGHTED TOTALS	RANKS
Reading (Skills, Comprehension, etc.)	29	33	20	10	265	1
Education in Motivating and Guiding Pupils	9	7	13	10	93	2
Education in Diagnosing Pupil Needs	11	5	9	4	81	3
Classroom Facilities	10	5	6	8	75	4
Non-Graded Program	10	4	7	5	71	5
Teaching Personnel	8	6	3	10	66	6
Curriculum Development	9	5	5	5	66	7
Individually Guided Instruction	4	5	9	16	65	8
Program for Slow Learners	6	8	4	4	60	9
Ineffective Teachers	9	4	3	5	59	10
Quality of Teacher Candidates	9	4	1	7	57	11
Primary Education (Grades 1-3)	2	11	5	4	55	12
School-Community Relations	7	3	3	3	46	13
Elementary School Guidance	3	8	2	4	44	14
Trade & Industrial Education (Building Trades, Automotive, etc.)	5	4	4	2	42	15

Remote Rural

As shown in Table XXVIII, the weighted total for Reading was significantly the overwhelming first priority for the Remote Rural sample. Weighted totals indicate a more gradual ranking of other needs. Second priority was given to Education in Motivating and Guiding Pupils, Program for Slow Learners was third, and Teaching Personnel was fourth.

This was the only group to add Kindergarten to the list of the composite of the total sample, and it was given fifth rank.

The Remote Rural sample did not include Education in Diagnosing Pupil Needs, Individually Guided Instruction, Curriculum Development, Ineffective Teachers, or Non-Graded Program as were indicated by the composite of the total sample, but added Kindergarten, Trade and Industrial Education, English, and University Education. This was the only sample to add School Facility Planning as a perceived educational need.

TABLE XXVIII

COMPOSITE RANKING OF PERCEIVED EDUCATIONAL NEEDS
IN ALL CATEGORIES BY THE REMOTE RURAL SAMPLE

EDUCATIONAL NEED	NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS RANKING THE NEED: FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH	WEIGHTED TOTALS	RANKS
Reading (Skills, Comprehension, etc.)	17	8	9	2	112	1
Education in Motivating and Guiding Pupils	4	4	4	6	42	2
Program for Slow Learners	4	4	3	4	38	3
Teaching Personnel	3	4	4	1	33	4
Kindergarten Education (5 Year Olds)	3	6	0	1	31	5
Primary Education (Grades 1-3)	1	5	2	3	26	6
School-Community Relations	1	5	1	4	25	7
University Education	5	0	2	1	25	8
English (Language Arts)	4	2	1	1	25	9
Quality of Teacher Candidates	4	1	2	1	24	10
Early Childhood (3-4 Year Olds)	4	2	0	2	24	11
School Facility Planning	3	2	1	3	23	12
Trade & Industrial Education (Building Trades, Automotive, etc.)	3	2	1	2	22	13
Elementary School Guidance	1	2	4	3	21	14
Classroom Facilities	2	2	1	1	17	15

Summary

Of the 15 imperative educational needs named in Table XXI, eight are aspects of the educational program, namely: Reading, Primary Education, Early Childhood Education, Elementary School Guidance, Curriculum Development, Non-Graded Program, Individually Guided Instruction, and Program for Slow Learners.

One of the needs pertains to school facilities, namely Classroom Facilities, and one pertains to School Community Relations. Five of the needs are related to the quality of teachers and teaching, these are: Education in Motivating and Guiding Pupils, Teaching Personnel (as a consideration of the budget), Education in Diagnosing Pupil Needs, Ineffective Teachers, and Quality of Teacher Candidates.

Some of the respondent groups did not include several of these 15 imperative needs, rather they emphasized other needs as imperative. Inspection of the following pages (Figure 13) illustrates these differences.

Needs	Rank of 15 Imperative Needs	School Boards	Educators	Students	Citizens	Urban	Rural	Remote Rural
Reading	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Education in Motivating and Guiding Pupils	2	2	6	4	2	3	2	2
Teaching Personnel	3	3	2	12	3	2	6	4
Education in Diagnosing Pupil Needs	4	15	5	5	4	5	3	-
Individually Guided Instruction	5	5	8	-	8	4	8	-
Primary Education	6	7	4	-	-	6	12	6
Quality of Teacher Candidates	7	6	14	9	5	8	11	10
School-Community Relations	8	8	12	-	9	7	13	7
Classroom Facilities	9	11	11	7	-	-	4	15
Curriculum Development	10	-	3	-	-	-	7	-
Program for Slow Learners	11	-	15	3	-	-	9	3
Elementary Guidance	12	-	10	-	-	10	14	14
Ineffective Teachers	13	9	-	-	6	11	10	-
Non-Graded Program	14	-	7	-	-	-	5	-
Early Childhood	15	10	13	-	-	13	-	11

(Continued on next page)

(Imperative Needs Added by Respondent Groups)

Needs	School Boards	Educators	Students	Citizens	Urban	Rural	Remote Rural
Evaluation of Teachers	4						
Program for Average Pupils	12						
Junior High School Education	13						
Building Maintenance and Operation	14						
Teacher Involvement in Decision Making		9					
University Education			2	13	9		8
Program for Alienated Youth			6		15		
Information on Careers and Occupations			8				
Technical Education			10				
Foreign Languages			11				
Junior High School Guidance			13				
Social Work			14				
Teachers Salaries			15		14		
Community College				7			
Trade and Industrial Education				10		15	13
English (Language Arts)				11			9
Teacher Turnover				12			

(Continued on next page)

(Imperative Needs Added by Respondent Groups)

Needs	School Boards	Educators	Students	Citizens	Urban	Rural	Remote Rural
Program for Academically Talented				14			
Long-Range Planning				15	12		
Kindergarten Education							5
School Facility Planning							12

Figure 13. Summary of Imperative Needs by All Groups and Geographic Areas

CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

The general purpose of this study was to gather opinions from a sample population of school board members, students, citizens, and educators as to what they considered to be the imperative educational needs in the State of Nevada. Such opinions were thought to be valuable in giving direction to policy decisions in the State regarding program planning and the allocation of funds.

A second general purpose was to determine the priorities given these needs by three geographic areas--Urban, Rural, and Remote Rural.

Finally, as in the 1969 State Assessment, this study sought to provide data for a statewide information system for the continuous assessment and evaluation of educational programs in the State.

Based on these objectives, it is concluded that this study was successful. The specific conclusions drawn from the data should provide new insights and understandings for the State Department of Education, school districts and other agencies throughout the State.

Conclusions

Based upon the major findings of this study, it is concluded that:

1. There are certain educational needs in the State of Nevada that are

viewed by the respondent groups as imperative--that is, additional emphasis should be given to them. As perceived by all groups, these needs, in order of importance, are: Reading, Education in Motivating and Guiding Pupils, Teacher Personnel, Education in Diagnosing Pupil Needs, Individually Guided Instruction, Primary Education, Quality of Teacher Candidates, School Community Relations, Classroom Facilities, Curriculum Development, Program for Slow Learners, Elementary School Guidance, Ineffective Teachers, Non-Graded Program, and Early Childhood Education.

2. As perceived by School Board Members, the imperative needs, in order of priority, are: Reading, Education in Motivating and Guiding Pupils, Teaching Personnel, Evaluation of Teachers, Individually Guided Instruction, Quality of Teacher Candidates, Primary Education, School-Community Relations, Ineffective Teachers, Early Childhood, Classroom Facilities, Program for Average Pupils, Junior High School Education, Building Maintenance and Operation, and Education in Diagnosing Pupil Needs.

3. The priority of needs in the opinion of Educators is: Reading, Teaching Personnel, Curriculum Development, Primary Education, Education in Diagnosing Pupil Needs, Education in Motivating and Guiding Pupils, Non-Graded Program, Individually Guided Instruction, Teacher Involvement in Decision Making, Elementary School Guidance, Classroom Facilities, School-Community Relations, Early Childhood, Quality of Teacher Candidates, Program for Slow Learners.

4. The views of Students rank these needs as: Reading, University Education, Program for Slow Learners, Education in Motivating and Guiding Pupils, Education in Diagnosing Pupil Needs, Program for Alienated Youth, Classroom Facilities, Information on Careers and Occupations, Quality of Teacher Candidates, Technical Education, Foreign Languages, Teaching Personnel, Junior High School Guidance, Social Work, and Teacher Salaries.

5. Citizens regard the following as needing most emphasis: Reading, Education in Motivating and Guiding Pupils, Teaching Personnel, Education in Diagnosing Pupil Needs, Quality of Teacher Candidates, Ineffective Teachers, Community College Education, Individually Guided Instruction, School-Community Relations, Trade and Industrial Education, English, Teacher Turnover, University Education, Program for Academically Talented, and Long-Range Program Planning.

6. Respondent groups do not always agree regarding the priority that the various educational needs should receive. While the priorities of Students are most often at variance with those of the other respondent groups, marked differences appear between and among School Board members, Educators, and Citizens.

7. When members of the respondent groups are arranged by geographic areas, the order of priority of needs again differs from the perceptions of the total group.

   The priority assignment of needs of the Urban areas is: Reading, Teaching Personnel, Education in Motivating and Guiding Pupils, Individually Guided Instruction, Education in Diagnosing Pupil Needs, Primary Education, School-Community Relations, Quality of Teacher Candidates, University Education, Elementary School Guidance, Ineffective Teachers, Long-Range Program Planning, Early Childhood, Teacher Salaries, Program for Alienated Youth.

   The imperative needs of the Rural areas are: Reading, Education in Motivating and Guiding Pupils, Education in Diagnosing Pupil Needs, Classroom Facilities, Non-Graded Program, Teaching Personnel, Curriculum Development, Individually Guided Instruction, Program for Slow Learners, Ineffective Teachers, Quality of Teacher Candidates, Primary Education, School-Community Relations, Elementary School Guidance, and Trade and Industrial Education.

   The Remote Rural areas designated five needs that were different than the 15 imperative needs assigned by all groups. Therefore, it is concluded that these areas of the State have special problems. The assignment of needs by the Remote Rural areas is: Reading, Education in Motivating and Guiding Pupils, Program for Slow Learners, Teaching Personnel, Kindergarten Education, Primary Education, School-Community Relations, University Education, English, Quality of Teacher Candidates, Early Childhood, School Facility Planning, Trade and Industrial Education, Elementary School Guidance, and Classroom Facilities.

8. All respondent groups and all areas of the State agree that reading is the first imperative need, and it is concluded that this subject should receive the greatest emphasis in decisions regarding the educational program of the State.

9. It is also concluded that programs in Education in Motivating and Guiding Pupils, Diagnosing Pupil Needs, and Individually Guided Instruction should receive greater emphasis.

10. Finally, it is concluded that problems concerning Teacher Personnel need consideration.

Implications

The conclusions drawn from the data gathered in this study suggest some implications relating to educational policy and for further research.

Implications for Educational Policy

The objectives and methodology of this study closely followed the 1969 Wisconsin Study. It is, therefore, proper to find similar implications for educational policy in this assessment. From the Wisconsin Study the following implication is appropriate:

> *It is of course clear that educational policy can never be derived directly from pooled opinions, however carefully they may be assessed. But in an informed democracy neither opinions nor perceptions can be ignored...The policy maker, then, must be in tune with prevailing opinions and perceptions and must reexamine his own opinions and perceptions in this light, recognizing that some degree of congruence is required for policy making to be attempted, accepted, and effective.*[1]

Future educational policy might well be guided by the major conclusions of this study. Each of the needs designated as most imperative by the respondent groups

---

[1] Wisconsin, op. cit., p. 79.

should be carefully examined. As suggested by the Wisconsin Study, the following questions should be asked: "Why?" Once answered, this question leads the policy maker naturally to other relevant ones: "How?," "Who?," "How much?," "Where?," and "When?"[2]

Such questions should be applied to the reading program in Nevada's schools. What data are available to support or refute the concern of the respondents as expressed in this study? What data are needed by the policy maker to answer the "why" regarding this number one priority?

Another implication for educational policy is inherent in the differences of opinions of the respondent groups. Policy decisions must recognize these variances, and policy makers should seek more information from the various sources suggested by this study. It would certainly be useful to give attention to the perceptions of students regarding educational needs as this group most often deviated from the others in their opinions.

There is implicit in the conclusions regarding the differing needs of the Remote Rural areas--that these areas of the State have special problems that should be considered. Policies must recognize the differences among the geographic areas.

The concern expressed regarding practices related to motivation, guidance, diagnosis of needs, and individualized instruction of pupils is related to the

---

[2] Ibid.

opinions regarding teachers and problems related to teaching personnel. There is an implication here for the need for more consideration regarding policies in the area of in-service education for teachers.

Finally it might be appropriate to examine the items which were not included in the final ranking of priority needs. For example, no item from the category Pre-Vocational and Occupational Programs was included. Does this mean that these programs are entirely successful, or is this area of little concern to the groups represented in this study?

Implications for Educational Research

A general purpose of this study was to provide information for the "continuous assessment and evaluation of educational programs in the State." Therefore, it would be inappropriate to suggest that attention be given to educational research. However, based on the findings of this study, several ideas for future directions are suggested.

1. The data of this study might be further analyzed in order to compare the opinions within the respondent groups. For example, do school board presidents perceive the educational needs the same as the newest board member? Do teachers and administrators have the same opinions? And, how do the perceptions of the various citizen groups agree or disagree?

2. It might also be fruitful to examine the opinions of the respondent groups within the geographic areas of the State. For example, how do the opinions of students differ in the Urban, Rural, and Remote Rural areas of the State?

3. In order to verify the findings of this study, it might be of value to replicate it before the end of the coming school year. A replication of this study might also be of value in the future in order to determine the progress made by educational programs in meeting the imperative needs indicated by the respondent groups.

4. Research is needed in order to determine why the educational needs were given the priority indicated by the rank order. Respondents could be asked the reasons for their rankings.

5. And finally, as suggested by the Wisconsin Study, answers to questions such as the following might be sought:

> *What historical, political, or economic factors in the larger society contribute to the priority rankings?, What demographic, social, or economic factors in the local district contribute to the rankings?, What factors in the nature and experiences of the respondent contribute to the rankings?, and Are either the current or the envisioned federal, state, and local programs directed toward the most imperative educational needs?*[3]

---

[3] Wisconsin, op. cit., p. 83.

APPENDIX A. RESPONDENTS CHOSEN FOR INTERVIEW IN NEVADA EDUCATIONAL NEEDS STUDY

Respondents In Urban Areas

	Number
School Boards	
President	2
Members (including newest board member)	6
Educators	
Central Administration (including Superintendent)	8
Principals	16
Teachers	36
Students	
Graduating (1970) Seniors	24
Citizens	
Elected Public Officials	6
Press	4
PTA	16
Employment Security	2

Respondents in Rural Areas

School Boards	
President	8
Members (including newest board member)	8

Respondents in Rural Areas (Cont.)

	Number
Educators	
Central Administration (including Superintendent)	16
Principals	32
Teachers	64
Students	
Graduating (1970) Seniors	24
Citizens	
Elected Public Officials	24
Press	13
PTA	16
Employment Security	6

Respondents in Remote Rural Areas

School Boards	
President	7
Members (including newest board member)	7
Educators	
Central Administration (including Superintendent)	7
Principals	8
Teachers	21
Students	
Graduating (1970) Seniors	21

Respondents in Remote Rural Areas (Cont.)

	Number
Citizens	
Elected Public Officials	14
Press	5
PTA	6
Employment Security	0

APPENDIX B. INTERVIEW INSTRUMENT

Background Information

1. Name_____
2. School District_____
3. Classification of Respondent

SCHOOL BOARDS:
_____ 1. Board President
_____ 2. Board Member

EDUCATORS:
_____ 3. Central Administrator
_____ 4. Principal
_____ 5. Teacher

STUDENTS:
_____ 6. Senior Student

CITIZENS:
_____ 7. Elected Public Official
_____ 8. Press
_____ 9. PTA
_____10. Employment Security

Category 1. Subject Fields

The cards in this group have items which are subject fields that may be taught in your school system. Rank these items so that the item that needs the "most additional emphasis" will be the top card. Continue ranking the items so that the item that needs the "least additional emphasis" will be the bottom card.

_____a. Science (General Science, Biology, etc.)

_____b. Social Studies (History, Geography, Government, etc.)

_____c. Vocational-Technical (Office, Agricultural, etc.)

_____d. Mathematics (Arithmetic, Algebra, etc.)

_____e. Industrial and Practical Arts (General Shop, Homemaking, etc.)

_____f. Reading (Skills, Comprehension, etc.)

_____g. Physical Education, Health and Safety Education

_____h. Fine Arts (Music, Art, Drama)

_____i. English (Language Arts)

_____j. Foreign Languages

Category 2. Level of Education

The cards in this group have items which are levels of education that may be needed by individuals--anyone at all--in your school district. Rank these items so that the item that needs the "most additional emphasis" will be the top card. Continue ranking the items so that the item that needs the "least additional emphasis" will be the bottom card.

_____a. Junior High School Education (Grades 7-9)

_____b. Post-Secondary Vocational-Technical Education

_____c. Adult Education

_____d. University Education

_____e. Early Childhood (3-4 year olds)

_____f. Senior High School Education (Grades 9-12)

_____g. Community College Education

_____h. Intermediate Level Education (Grades 4-6)

_____i. Kindergarten Education (5 year olds)

_____j. Primary Education (Grades 1-3)

Category 3. Pre-Vocational and Occupational Programs

The cards in this group have items which are kinds of pre-vocational and occupational programs which may be needed by individuals in your school district. Rank these items so that the item that needs the "most additional emphasis" will be the top card. Continue ranking the items so that the item that needs the "least additional emphasis" will be the bottom card.

_____a. Vocational Agriculture (Off-Farm, Production, etc.)

_____b. Distributive Education (Merchandising, Sales, etc.)

_____c. Health Occupations Education (Nursing, Health Aides, etc.)

_____d. Office Occupations Education (Secretarial, Clerical, etc.)

_____e. Home Economics (Food and Child Care Services, etc.)

_____f. Basic Business Education (General Business, Business Exploratory, etc.)

_____g. Consumer and Homemaking (Buying, Clothing, etc.)

_____h. Technical Education (Electronics, Radio, T.V., etc.)

_____i. Trade and Industrial Education (Building Trades, Automotive, etc.)

_____j. Industrial Arts (Exploratory, General Shop, etc.)

Category 4. Teacher Personnel

The cards in this group have items which are concerns related to teacher personnel that may exist in your school district. Rank these items so that the item that needs the "most additional emphasis" will be the top card. Continue ranking the items so that the item that needs the "least additional emphasis" will be the bottom card.

_____a. Methods of Teacher Selection

_____b. Teacher Utilization and Specialization

_____c. Teacher Involvement in Decision Making

_____d. Ineffective Teachers

_____e. Supply of Teacher Candidates

_____f. Teacher Militancy

_____g. Quality of Teacher Candidates

_____h. Teacher Turnover

_____i. Evaluation of Teachers

_____j. Teacher Salaries

Category 5. Administrative Services

The cards in this group have items which are administrative services that may be needed in your school district. Rank these items so that the item that needs the "most additional emphasis" will be the top card. Continue ranking the items so that the item that needs the "least additional emphasis" will be the bottom card.

_____a. Long-range Program Planning

_____b. Research and Evaluation

_____c. Staff Personnel Services

_____d. Pupil Personnel Services

_____e. School-Community Relations

_____f. School Facility Planning

_____g. Curriculum Development

_____h. Data Processing

_____i. Business Management

_____j. Supervision of Instruction

Category 6. Pupil Services

The cards in this group have items which are kinds of services that may be needed for pupils in your school district. Rank these items so that the item that needs the "most additional emphasis" will be the top card. Continue ranking the items so that the item that needs the "least additional emphasis" will be the bottom card.

_____a. School Health

_____b. Social Work

_____c. Junior High School Guidance

_____d. Psychological Testing and Referral

_____e. Achievement Testing

_____f. Follow-Up of Graduates

_____g. Elementary School Guidance

_____h. Educational-Vocational Placement

_____i. In-School Placement of Pupils

_____j. Information on Careers and Occupations

Category 7. Budget Allocations

The cards in this group have items which are categories of budget allocation in your school district. Rank these items so that the item that needs the "most additional emphasis" will be the top card. Continue ranking the items so that the item that needs the "least additional emphasis" will be the bottom card.

_____a. Transportation

_____b. Supportive Personnel (Clerical, Aides, etc.)

_____c. Specialized Personnel (Counselors, Psychologists, Social Workers, etc.)

_____d. Administrative and Supervisory Personnel

_____e. Classroom Facilities

_____f. Building Maintenance and Operation

_____g. Teaching Personnel

_____h. Libraries and Instructional Center Facilities

_____i. Textbooks and Instructional Supplies

_____j. Audio-Visual Equipment

Category 8. Instructional Approaches

The cards in this group have items which represent approaches to instruction that may be needed in your school district. Rank these items so that the item that needs the "most additional emphasis" will be the top card. Continue ranking the items so that the item that needs the "least additional emphasis" will be the bottom card.

_____a. Individually Guided Instruction

_____b. Inquiry Approach (Discovery Method of Instruction)

_____c. Homebound Instruction

_____d. Computer Assisted Instruction

_____e. Television Assisted Instruction

_____f. Audio-Visual Instruction Other Than Educational TV

_____g. Non-Graded Program

_____h. Instructional Aides and Resource Persons

_____i. Staffing Patterns (Team Teaching, etc.)

_____j. Flexible Scheduling

Category 9. Educational Programs

The cards in this group have items which are educational programs that may be needed in your school district. Rank these items so that the item that needs the "most additional emphasis" will be the top card. Continue ranking the items so that the item that needs the "least additional emphasis" will be the bottom card.

_____a. Program for Average Pupils

_____b. Program for Educationally Disadvantaged

_____c. Program for High School Terminal Students

_____d. Program for Alienated Youth (Potential Dropouts, Unmotivated, etc.)

_____e. Program for Academically Talented

_____f. Program for Culturally Distinct

_____g. Program for Emotionally Disturbed

_____h. Program for Slow Learners

_____i. Program for Mentally Handicapped (Trainable, Educable, etc.)

_____j. Program for Physically Handicapped (Visual, Orthopedic, etc.)

Category 10. In-Service Education

The cards in this group have items which are kinds of in-service education programs that may be needed by teachers in your district. Rank these items so that the item that needs the "most additional emphasis" will be the top card. Continue ranking the items so that the item that needs the "least additional emphasis" will be the bottom card.

_____a. Education in Varied Staffing Patterns (Team Teaching, etc.)

_____b. Education in Student and Program Evaluation

_____c. Education in Reporting Pupil Progress

_____d. Education in Classroom Management

_____e. Education in Group Dynamics and Human Relations

_____f. Education in Motivating and Guiding Pupils

_____g. Education in Subject Matter Content

_____h. Education in Selecting and Utilizing Materials and Equipment

_____i. Education in Diagnosing Pupil Needs

_____j. Education in Planning Instruction and Developing Curriculum

Question 11. All Categories

This last group of cards includes those cards you ranked first in each category. Now, using the same procedure as before, rank these ten cards so that the item on the card that needs the "most additional emphasis" will be on top and the item on the card that needs the "least additional emphasis" will be on the bottom.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____